REPORT RESUMES

ED 011 082 24

THE EXTENT AND NATURE OF FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES IN LARGE PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES.

BY- NICKERSON, MELVIN R.

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIV., DE KALB

REPORT NUMBER CRP-S-413 PUB DATE 66

REPORT NUMBER BR-5-8257

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.27 HC-$6.84 171P.

DESCRIPTORS- *STUDENT PERSONNEL WORK, *UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION, QUESTIONNAIRES, *FACULTY, INTERACTION, *STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES, DEKALB

THIS INVESTIGATION WAS MADE TO STUDY THE INVOLVEMENT OF FACULTY MEMBERS IN COMMITTEE WORK AND IN SELECTED STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES. THE EFFECTIVENESS LEVEL OF SELECTED STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES IN FIVE LARGE PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES WAS COMPARED TO CERTAIN ASPECTS OF FACULTY PARTICIPATION TO DETERMINE WHAT RELATIONSHIPS EXISTED. A THREE-PART QUESTIONNAIRE WAS CONSTRUCTED TO GATHER BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE FACULTY PARTICIPANT, DATA CONCERNING HIS MEMBERSHIP IN THE COMMITTEE STRUCTURE OF A UNIVERSITY WHICH RELATED TO ONE OR MORE OF THE STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES, AND THE EXTENT AND NATURE OF HIS INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPATION. CONCLUSIONS WERE DETERMINED AND REPORTED. IMPLICATIONS WERE MADE AND A DESCRIPTION MADE OF AN IDEALIZED PROGRAM OF STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES. (TC)

Bureau # 5 8257

[redacted]

THE EXTENT AND NATURE OF FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES IN LARGE PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Cooperative research project number: S-413

Melvin R. Nickerson

Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois

1966

The research reported herein was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

ED011082

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES iv

Chapter

I. THE PROBLEM AND PROCEDURE 1

Importance of the Study
Statement of the Problem
Hypotheses
Faculty Participation
Related Research
Procedures
Selected Areas of Student Personnel Services
Universities Chosen for the Study
Instruments Developed
Collection of Data
Analysis and Interpretation of Data
Limitations of the Study
Definitions of Terms Used

II. METHODS 20

Campus Interviews
Collecting the Data
Treatment of the Data

III. THE EXTENT OF FACULTY PARTICIPATION 32

Review of the Study
Faculty Participation by University
Faculty Participation by Academic Rank
Faculty Participation by Age
Amount of Monthly Participation

IV. THE NATURE OF FACULTY PARTICIPATION 51

Effectiveness of Faculty Participation
Reason for Effectiveness
Sources of Appreciation

CONTENTS

Chapter Page

Willingness to Serve or Participate Again
Attitude of University Toward the Student
Preferred Source for Recruiting Student Personnel Officers

V. IMPORTANT ISSUES DISCUSSED BY COMMITTEE 72

Important Issues Discussed by Student Personnel Service
Topical Listing of Issues
Committee Recommendations Made
To Whom Recommendations Were Made
Action Taken on Committee Recommendations
Preferred Action on Recommendations
Nature of Issues
Significance of Issues
Reasons for Reported Significance of Issues

VI. THE RELATIONSHIP OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS TO FACULTY PARTICIPATION 99

Measurement of Program Effectiveness
The Relationship of Program Effectiveness and Faculty Participation

VII. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 113

Summary
Conclusions
Recommendations

APPENDIX A. Revised Rackham Student Personnel Service Profile Scores 140

APPENDIX B. Letter of Transmittal to Faculty Participants . . 146

APPENDIX C. The Questionnaire on Faculty Participation . . . 148

APPENDIX D. Topical Tabulation of Issues Discussed by Committees 157

BIBLIOGRAPHY 160

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page

1. Enrollment and Cost Comparisons at Selected Universities 21

2. Faculty Participation Questionnaires Mailed and Returned 27

3. Percentage of Respondents by Area of Student Personnel Services and Type of Participation 34

4. Percentage of Respondents by Academic Rank and Type of Faculty Participation 38

5. Percentage of Respondents by Age and Type of Faculty Participation 42

6. Percentage of Respondents by Hours and Type of Monthly Committee Participation 46

7. Percentage of Respondents by Hours and Frequency of Monthly Individual Participation 48

8. Percentage of Respondents by Reported Effectiveness and Type of Faculty Participation 52

9. Percentage of Respondents by Reason Reported for Committee Effectiveness 55

10. Percentage of Responses by Reason Reported for Personal Effectiveness in Individual Participation 57

11. Percentage of Respondents by Source of Appreciation and Type of Participation 60

12. Percentage of Respondents by Willingness to Serve or Participate Again in Type of Faculty Participation 64

Table Page

13. Percentage of Respondents by Attitude of University Toward Students and Type of Faculty Participation 67

14. Percentage of Respondents by Preferred Source for Recruiting Student Personnel Services and Type of Faculty Participation 70

15. Percentage of Respondents by Student Personnel Services Represented for Two Most Important Issues Discussed 74

16. Percentage of Respondents by Committee Recommendations Made for Two Most Important Issues Discussed 78

17. Percentage of Respondents by Whom Committee Recommendations Were Made for Two Most Important Issues Discussed 81

18. Percentage of Respondents by Action Taken on Committee Recommendations for Two Most Important Issues Discussed 85

19. Percentage of Respondents by Preferred Action on Committee Recommendations for Two Most Important Issues Discussed 88

20. Percentage of Respondents by Nature of Two Most Important Issues Discussed by Committees 92

21. Percentage of Respondents by Significance of Two Most Important Issues Discussed by Committees 93

22. Percentage of Respondents by Reasons for Reported Significance for Two Most Important Issues Discussed by Committees 96

23. The Effectiveness of Selected Areas of Student Personnel Services, also Selected Measures of Faculty Participation in Committee Work and in Individual (Non-committee) Participation 101

24. Correlations of Program Effectiveness Ratings of Certain Areas of Student Personnel Services 104

25. Correlations of Selected Measures of Faculty Participation with Program Effectiveness Ratings in Certain Student Personnel Services 108

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND PROCEDURE

Importance of the Study

The history of higher education in the United States shows a growth from simple college structures to complex universities which provide education for greater numbers of students. At the same time colleges and universities are expanding their curricular offerings to encompass new programs which specialize in areas which provide different functions as the educational enterprise changes to meet current societal needs.

As institutions have grown larger they have taken on a different characteristic. There has been a trend away from the predominance of private schools and a shift of the pendulum toward publicly-controlled universities. Hungate reports that at the turn of the century fewer than forty per cent of the quarter million degree-credit students were enrolled in public institutions. In the fall of the academic year 1961-1962 over sixty per cent of the 3.9 million degree-credit students were enrolled in publicly-controlled universities.[1] The trend toward publicly-controlled universities is likely to continue.

---

[1] Thad L. Hungate, Management in Higher Education (New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1964), p. 32.

As university enrollments enlarged, the personal relationship between the instructor and the student became increasingly more difficult to maintain. To combat both numbers and complexity of structure universities have tended to expand their student personnel services and to recruit professionally educated staff which specialized in the various areas. To administer this program a major executive has been added who is delegated principal responsibility for management of student personnel services. The chief student personnel officer is in charge of both services related to the academic program and for student services.

An abdication by the faculty member of his traditional role has accompanied the specialization of student personnel services. According to Millett there are several reasons for this development.

> Faculty members have tended to withdraw from direct contact with students except in the classroom and in the office where an immediate academic problem is involved. . . . The emergence of both a specialized point of view and a specialized competence in working with students has encouraged the growth of student personnel work. Most faculty members now defer to this specialized competence and acknowledge that they have little basis in knowledge or experience for handling the complex social problems of present-day students.[2]

The emergence of large universities and the complexity of their programs brought about a need for professionally trained specialists in the various aspects of student personnel services. As universities continue to grow and as the degree of impersonalization increases, it becomes apparent that there is a greater need for concern.

---

[2] John D. Millett, The Academic Community (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962), p. 204.

The president of the American Council on Education has warned that the college student is in danger of becoming the forgotten man of higher education. He too decries the decreasing opportunity for interpersonal relationships:

> The rate of expansion of college enrollment may leave the student with less personal contact with the faculty and college staff members . . . the faceless anonymity of programmed instruction, IBM cards and identification numbers represent the depersonalization of the student, if allowed to go unchecked or unchallenged, represents a grave threat to the very purposes of higher education.[3]

The organizational structure which depersonalizes the individual student is in need of review. The student personnel worker as an administrative officer requires policies which are acceptable to the academic community. To administer a workable program the student personnel officer must involve the instructional staff member at every level. His influence is necessary in both policy determination and in program implementation.

Statement of the Problem

The central purpose of this investigation was to determine the extent and nature of faculty participation and to study the relationship of this faculty participation to the effectiveness of selected student personnel services in large publicly-assisted universities. Faculty participation will consist of three basic factors: (1) the extent of faculty participation, (2) the nature of participation, (3) the issues discussed by committees and boards relating to the selected student personnel services. The effectiveness of student personnel services consists of a measurement of selected areas.

---

[3] Logan Wilson, "College Student May Become 'Forgotten Man' of Education," Higher Education and National Affairs, XIII (October 23, 1964), p. 7.

Hypotheses

1. The larger the number of faculty participants serving in committee work at universities the more effective will be the program of student personnel services.
2. The larger the number of individual participants at universities the more effective will be the program of student personnel services.
3. The higher the academic rank of committee members at universities the more effective will be the program of student personnel services.
4. The higher the academic rank of individual participants at universities the more effective will be the program of student personnel services.
5. The older the age of committee members at universities the more effective will be the program of student personnel services.
6. The older the age of individual participants at universities the more effective will be the program of student personnel services.

Faculty Participation

The recent growth and resultant complexity of institutions of higher learning has necessitated newer methods of organization and operation to enable them to accomplish their objectives. Where once the simple structure of a college enabled a united faculty in constant dialogue with students and administrators to act as shareholders in the educational enterprise, the situation now resembles a centrally operated representative form of government.

Traditionally, the ultimate authority for a university has been vested in the governing board. Broad guidelines are established for delegation of authority to the president of the university and through him to administrative specialists. The conduct of the program involves many levels of a university depending on the administrative function to be performed, the size of the university, the type of institution, and its organization pattern.

Serious students of university administration have indicated dissatisfaction with current practices. As they become larger and more complex, the prerogatives which were once the province of a community of scholars are assumed by specialists who may be out of touch with the will of the majority. On many campuses there is outspoken criticism of administrative leadership and increasing concern for more extensive involvement of the members of the academic community in the conduct of university affairs.

Two recent incidents on American campuses seem to validate the concern expressed for the direction which universities seem to have taken. At the University of California at Berkeley the students themselves in 1964 shocked the status quo by proclaiming their rights and utilizing methods learned and made effective in the civil disobedience demonstrations more familiar to the segregationist South than to the San Francisco Bay area. The resultant furor caused a reorganization of the administrative high-command and irreparable damage to the generally accepted image of Berkeley as a multi-versity prototype.

When the faculty of the University of California voted for the right of students to protest administrative restrictions which were placed on student political activities, the Board of Regents decided in favor of the university administration.

In 1965 dissatisfaction with an allegedly conservative administration at St. John's University of New York City resulted in the summary dismissal of more than a score of tenure faculty members and an unprecedented strike by sympathetic colleagues on the basis that academic freedom was being violated by a clerically dominated establishment.

Although these two dramatic illustrations represent opposite poles of institutional governance and support, they do serve a useful purpose. These examples indicate that everyone is not content with the centralization of authority in the hands of the administrators.

Professor Algo D. Henderson has expressed the feeling that the vertical pattern of organization is contrary to the peculiar nature of a collegiate administrative structure and would be more suitable in a decentralized plan of operation:

> The horizontal structure is important because the . . . faculty are experts and professional people and not ordinary employees, and decisions need to be made near the scene of activity. The vertical structure removes the highest administrative officers from the immediacy of contact with deans, department heads, and faculty, as well as with students, and results in top-level, cabinet-made decisions. Attempts are then made to 'sell' the decisions to the faculty groups. This leads to frustrations both for the administrators and for the faculty.[4]

---

[4] Algo D. Henderson, "Improving Decision Making Through Research," Current Issues in Higher Education--1963, XVIII (March, 1963), p. 154.

Clark Kerr has alluded to the modern university as a multiversity which requires a system of government like a city. "It may be inconsistent but is must be governed--not as the guild it once was, but as a complex entity with greatly fractionalized power."[5]

The source of this power initially resided with the students themselves. In the original university the students hired the instructor and elected to hear a lecture or boycott his recitation as they pleased. To a certain extent this method of election still rests with the individual student who can choose his favorite professor and help determine in which direction a university will grow.[6]

A second source of power rests with the traditional concept of the faculty as members of guilds and is thus responsible for establishing and maintaining conditions under which freedom of inquiry might flourish. To the American Association of University Professors this responsibility must be exercised not only in their individual capacity as teachers but in their "corporate authority in the governance of the institutions in which they serve."[7]

The corporate authority of the A.A.U.P. is referred to as faculty self-government by Dodds. He found that colleges and universities of exceptional eminence were those which often brought instructional staff members into the decision-making process.

---

[5] Clark Kerr, The Uses of the University (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964), p. 20.

[6] Ibid., p. 22.

[7] American Association of University Professors, Committee S., "Statement on Faculty Responsibility for the Academic Freedom of Students," A.A.U.P. Bulletin, L, No. 3 (September, 1964), p. 254.

> In each, the trend has been to draw the faculty into advance consultation on broad institutional policies formerly considered to be within the exclusive domain of the trustees, advised by the administration.[8]

The active involvement of faculty members in the processes of administration makes it possible to obtain a consensus from which to formulate policies and procedures for institutional objectives. Mueller advocates this procedure as helpful to the student personnel administrator for the following reasons:

> (1) Faculty members have the largest number of person-to-person student contacts, and therefore know individual and group opinions: (2) they look to their own long tradition, have a strong vested interest in the counseling of students, and very rightly cling to their full share of these privileges and responsibilities: (3) they have important points of view in their own right which can help in making almost any project successful.[9]

The initial unity of the faculty of the early university though has experienced an erosion with the concept of the multiversity. The earlier concept is represented by the A.A.U.P. which still clings to the idea that the faculty should have "primary responsibility for determining the educational policies of the institution."[10]

The concept of self-government has been replaced in actuality by a shift in the center of power from the faculty to a decentralization of authority. According to Mooney the single center of power is now represented by a system of subordinate functions in the modern university.

---

[8] Harold W. Dodds, The Academic President--Educator or Caretaker (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962), p. 6.

[9] Kate Hevner Mueller, Student Personnel Work in Higher Education (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961), p. 138.

[10] American Association of University Professors, Committee T., "Faculty Participation in College and University Government," A.A.U.P. Bulletin, XLVIII, No. 4 (December, 1962), p. 321.

> What was formerly taken as a clear center of power, i.e. the assembled faculty, is no longer an effective instrument for making institutional decisions. It is too big, too diverse. Typically, a university has a sizeable faculty council, made up of representatives of the academic staff, to take up the prerogatives formerly held by the total faculty assembly. Feeding into these are . . . further councils, committees, boards, and institutes. . . . Such units overlay or cross through the traditional colleges, schools, bureaus, experiment stations, and departments.[11]

To enable a university with an enormous enrollment to handle its problems it has become necessary to transfer the authority of the assembled faculty. Universities have substituted delegation of authority to competent specialists for the much lamented interpersonal relationships between faculty, administration, and students in a more leisurely era.

Academic officers have been established to handle problems which were once the jurisdiction of the president or the faculty as a body. Corson explains the effect on both the administration and the faculty as a limitation and a loss of status respectively:

> On the one hand, college and university presidents complain about the limitations placed upon their exercise of executive discretion by the power of the faculty. On the other hand, some faculty members complain that their status is no longer substantial, nor as dignified.[12]

---

[11] Ross L. Mooney, "The Problem of Leadership," Harvard Educational Review, XXXIII, No. 1, (Winter, 1963), p. 49.

[12] John J. Corson, Governance of Colleges and Universities (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960), P. 6.

The most conspicuous difference between institutions of higher learning consists of size. It is in large institutions however that the greatest similarities occur. Mueller identifies these characteristics as follows: (1) the larger universities are in the majority publicly controlled, (2) they are similar in their development of standard procedures for handling large numbers of students, (3) they attract students from an immediate geographic area, (4) public universities cannot maintain any rigid selection of students who seek admission, and (5) the relationships among students, and between students and faculty, are less intimate and require a greater amount of self-reliance and aggressiveness than on smaller campuses.[13]

Related Research

The study of faculty participation in student personnel services appears to have had little investigation. While there are expert opinions which advocate the need for extensive involvement of faculty and administration in determination of policy, no investigation has been applied to the extent and nature of such participation.

A survey of the literature on evaluative techniques provides several measures of the effectiveness of individual student personnel services. The Evaluation Report Form was developed by Wrenn and Kamm.[14]

---

[13] Mueller, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-8.

[14] C. G. Wrenn and R. B. Kamm, "A Procedure for Evaluating a Student Personnel Program," *School and Society*, LXVII (April 3, 1948), pp. 266-69.

This study divided the student personnel program into fourteen areas and then rated the effectiveness of each by: (1) an evaluation of the administrative attitude toward each area, and (2) a check for the presence or absence of desirable elements under each of the areas.

Rackham developed the Student Personnel Services Inventory as his doctoral dissertation at the University of Michigan.[15] He submitted tentative student personnel services criteria to 381 personnel officers in 113 colleges and universities. On the basis of replies received, he constructed an 848-item rating scale which covered the following fifteen areas of student personnel work:

1. Admissions
2. Counseling
3. Discipline
4. Extra-Curricular Activities
5. Financial Aids
6. Health Services
7. Housing and Board
8. Organization and Administration
9. Orientation
10. Placement
11. Pre-College Counseling
12. Records
13. Religion
14. Research
15. Testing

---

[15] Eric N. Rackham, "The Determination of Criteria of the Evaluation of Student Personnel Services in Insitiutions of Higher Learning" (unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Michigan, 1950).

Rackham then submitted the rating scale to ten national experts in student personnel work to weigh the relative importance of each item under each service to the total personnel program. The combined ratings as given by the ten judges were used to assign weights (ranging from -2 through 0 to +5) to each item.

Mahler administered the Rackham Inventory in four Minnesota institutions and compared it with an instrument which he developed for both students and faculty of these four institutions. Rank order correlations between the Rackham Inventory and Mahler's Student Personnel Services Scales were in the order of r = .80.[16]

The Rackham Inventory was subsequently refined in a study by Hage.[17] An interview-questionnaire was developed and administered to nineteen Kansas colleges together with the original Rackham Inventory. Hage eliminated all items on the original instrument which were rated -2, -1, 0, +1, as well as those items which showed poor discrimination. The number of items was reduced from 848 to 328.

The data were then rescored in terms of the items retained in the revised Rackham Inventory. Rank order correlations were computed. A correlation of +.96 was obtained between the original and the revised Rackham Inventory.

It appears that the revised Rackham Inventory is a more useful instrument than the original as it is less cumbersome and takes less time to administer. Moreover, the measurement provided by the original is provided to a high degree on the Revised Rackham Inventory.

---

[16] Clarence A. Mahler, "A Study of Student and Faculty Reactions to Student Personnel Work" (unpublished Ph. D Thesis, University of Minnesota, 1956).

[17] Robert S. Hage, "A Revision of the Rackham Student Personnel Services Inventory" (unpublished Ph. D Thesis, State University of Iowa, 1957).

Procedures

The problem was analyzed by a review of related literature in the field to obtain information which would contribute to the objectives of this research. It was determined that certain areas of student personnel services lend themselves more readily to faculty participation than others, and these areas were selected for the investigation. The universities were then chosen on the basis of their similarities in size, nature, and proximity.

Selected Areas of Student Personnel Services

The scope of the investigation was limited to eight selected areas in the program of student personnel services of five comparable publicly-assisted universities in the Midwest. The eight areas of student personnel services were: (1) counseling, (2) discipline, (3) extra-curricular activities, (4) financial aid, (5) housing and board, (6) organization and administration, (7) orientation, and (8) placement.

Universities Chosen for the Study

The universities chosen for the study were: (1) The University of Illinois, (2) Indiana University, (3) The University of Michigan, (4) Purdue University, and (5) The University of Wisconsin.

Since no previous work was discovered in the review of the literature, it was concluded that instruments would have to be developed to elicit information about the nature and extent of faculty participation in student personnel services.

Instruments Developed

An instrument was designed and tested at Northern Illinois University to obtain information about faculty participation from the faculty participants themselves. The Revised Rackham Student Personnel Services Inventory was used to secure a measure of the effectiveness of the program of student personnel services. The measure of program success was compared with the measurement of both extent and nature of faculty participation in the respective areas of student personnel services with which this investigation was concerned.

Collection of Data

Data were collected from student personnel officers in each of the five universities chosen. Information was obtained from those responsible for the selected areas.

Student personnel officers

Each officer was sent a cover letter and a questionnarie. The person responsible for one of the eight student personnel service areas selected for this study was requested to complete the Revised Rackham Student Personnel Services Inventory. The person in charge of each area was also asked to meet with the investigator. In addition, each officer was asked to nominate those faculty members who were active participants in committee and board work or who otherwise participated individually as advisers to student organizations, as chaperones, or as consultants to the student personnel area for which the officer was responsible. Personal interviews were then conducted with each of the responsible student personnel officers of the selected areas during which the student personnel inventory and the list of faculty participants were collected.

Faculty participants

Information was obtained from faculty participants by sending a questionnaire and an accompanying cover letter and stamped return envelope. The questionnaire consisted of three parts.

1. Part I gathered general information about the following data.
    - a) The area of student personnel service in which participation occurred
    - b) The name of the committee or board
    - c) The type of individual involvement
    - d) Data on academic rank, age, and sex of the faculty participant
2. Part II collected information relating to specific committee or board activity.
    - a) The data concerning the number of hours per month in which participation took place
    - b) How much of that was in committee or board activity
    - c) The method of selection for committee or board membership
    - d) The first two issues discussed by a committee or board
    - e) The recommendation that was made regarding each issue discussed
    - f) The person to whom the recommendation was made, or the source to which it was referred
    - g) The action that was taken on the recommendation

h) The action that should have taken place
i) The question of whether the issues discussed were policy-making or program execution
j) The question of whether the issues discussed were significant
k) The reason for the faculty member accepting the appointment
l) Rating by the individual of the effectiveness of the committee
m) The reasons given for the effectiveness rating reported
n) Whether colleagues, superior, students, the administration and self-satisfaction were sources of appreciation for participation
o) The question whether the person would serve again if asked
p) The attitude of the university toward the student
q) The preferred source of recruitment for student personnel officers

3. Part III gathered data which had to do with the individual (non-committee) activities of committee participants.

a) The role of the participant
b) The amount of time per month spent
c) The number of times per month participation occurred
d) The frequency of accepting an opportunity to participate
e) The method by which the faculty member was selected
f) The rating of the individual as to his effectiveness in this area of student personnel service
g) The reason why he felt as he did about the effectiveness of his participation
h) The reasons given for agreeing to participate
i) The sentiment expressed about personal participation in this area
j) Whether colleagues, superior, students, the administration and self-satisfaction were sources of appreciation for participation
k) The matter of whether the person would participate again if asked
l) the attitude of the university toward the student
m) The preferred source of recruitment for student personnel officers

In each instance, faculty members were sent the form of the questionnaire which related to their particular participation. Every participant received a Part I form and was asked to fill out a Part II or a Part III form, or both, to collect the required information. To secure the optimum amount of information, a reminder was sent to faculty participants who had not responded after three weeks had elapsed.

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

After all interviews were conducted with student personnel officers and all available returns were received, interpretation of the data was completed by the investigator. Treatment of data consisted of key punching computer cards, sorting, verifying, interpreting, programming and listing frequency distributions, and correlations of data for analysis.

Limitations of the Study

The investigation was limited to the extent and nature of faculty participation in eight selected areas of the program of student personnel services in five large publicly-assisted multi-purpose universities in the midwestern section of the United States.

The study should not be interpreted to represent other sizes and types of institutions of higher learning or other geographic areas of the country. Moreover, since the study was limited to eight selected areas of student personnel services it should be construed as applicable only to those areas included and not to other services which were omitted.

Student personnel officers

The results of the study are based on the assumption that the student personnel officers responsible for the selected areas within each university were able to provide: (1) an accurate evaluation of the area of the program for which they were assigned jurisdiction, and (2) appropriate information about the nature and extent of faculty participation within these selected services.

Faculty participants

This investigation was limited by the degree of knowledge possessed by faculty participants. It was dependent upon their involvement in committee work or in the student personnel area in which they participated.

Data collected

The study was further delimited by the data collected, by the degree of personal bias of the investigator, and by the reliability of the instruments used in this study.

Definitions of Terms Used

Student personnel officers

Administrative officers who were assigned responsibility for the selected areas of student personnel services.

Faculty participants

Those instructional staff members who were primarily associated with the academic program of the university.

Committees and/or boards

This includes all committees and boards relating to the study.

Individual participation

The participation of faculty members individually was interpreted to mean personal involvement in non-committee activities. For the purpose of this investigation, this included activities such as advising student organizations, and acting as consultants to student personnel officers.

CHAPTER II

METHODS

This investigation concerned the extent and nature of faculty participation in selected student personnel services and its relationship to program effectiveness in several large public universities. *The hypotheses are stated on page 4.*

The universities were chosen on the basis of similarities in size, complexity, purpose, and proximity for campus visitations. The similarities between these universities consist of large enrollments, a multi-purpose program serving both liberal arts and professional programs, and a large number of faculty members to accomplish the goals of the university. Moreover, these institutions of higher learning represent a public service policy of low cost tuition, fees, and board and room.

The latest information available indicates that basic similarities do exist. Comparative figures on the universities selected for this study are listed in Table 1.

The student personnel services chosen were those that seemed to lend themselves more easily to faculty participation which could be identified than did certain others. Because of their size and complexity the universities were found to possess well developed student personnel programs which were comparable in services provided.

TABLE 1

ENROLLMENT AND COST COMPARISONS AT SELECTED UNIVERSITIES

University	Enrollment October 1964	Number of Teachers	Average Tuition and Academic Cost for School Year 1964-65	Average Cost of Board and Room for School Year 1964-65	Average Total Cost for School Year 1964-65
Illinois	34,634	2,521	$170	$820	$1,565
Indiana	36,397	3,100	$330	$775	$1,430
Michigan	29,103	2,968	----	$900	------
Purdue	24,932	1,800	----	$900	$1,230
Wisconsin	26,293	-----	$300	$860	$1,575

Reported in the National Beta Club 1964-1965 College Facts Chart (October 1, 1964), J. W. Harris, Editor; Jacobs Brothers, Printers, Clinton, S.C.

Differences were found however in the involvement of faculty members in the decision-making process and in the implementation of these services.

The particular focus of this study was primarily concerned with faculty participation in committee and board activities and in individual involvement of faculty members in non-committee activity. To secure this information it was necessary for the investigator to visit personally each of the universities to construct a list of faculty participants and to secure a measure of the relative effectiveness of the selected student personnel services at each university.

Campus Interviews

To secure the cooperation of student personnel officers, I obtained permission from the respective universities to conduct the study. An interview schedule was established prior to a personal visit to each campus.

Committee and board participants

During the campus visitations a current list of committee and board members relating to the selected areas of student personnel services was obtained from each of the universities. The lists were checked with the student personnel officers who were functionally responsible for the areas under investigation.

Individual faculty participants

These same administrative officials were asked to designate those faculty members who participated individually in non-committee activities. This was done through personal interviews at which time the student personnel officers were asked to name faculty members who were actively involved as advisors, discussion leaders, lecturers, critics, or who served in any other capacity. *Since a majority of faculty members participate in the academic advisement of students this aspect was excluded from the study.*

Effectiveness measurement

To secure a measure of the program effectiveness of the selected areas of student personnel services, an evaluative instrument was utilized. Each student personnel officer interviewed for a list of faculty participants was requested to complete the Revised Rackham Student Personnel Services Inventory.[1] *The results of the application of the Rackham Inventory are included as profile scores for each university in Appendix A.*

Collecting the Data

Upon completion of the campus visitations a review was made of the lists of faculty members designated as participants in the selected student personnel services. All phases of the individual faculty member's participation were reviewed. Both committee and board activity and individual participation were consolidated before sending the questionnaires and letters requesting information.

Letter of transmittal

Each person was then sent an individually typed letter which explained that he had been designated as an active participant in the student personnel services program of his university by a member of the administrative staff. The name of the university, the student personnel area involved, and the type of participation were written on the questionnaire to make the communication more personal. The original letter was prepared on the auto-typewriter to enhance the identification of the individual with his particular involvement. *A copy of the original letter may be found in Appendix B.*

---

[1] For a more detailed discussion of the Rackham Inventory see pp. 11-13

The three-part questionnaire

There were three different parts to the questionnaire. Each part was specifically designated with the personal participation of each individual before the form was sent. Part I was a biographical section and had the name of the person and the university written in. Part II collected information relative to committee and board activity so that the name of the appropriate body was provided. Part III pertained to individual participation in non-committee work so that the area of student personnel service and the type of involvement was filled in. *A copy of the three-part questionnaire is included in the study as Appendix C.*

Identification of the type of faculty participation

Each questionnaire was transmitted with a stamped return envelope and with instructions in the personal letter to complete the biographical section and either or both of the other two sections as applicable to that particular person's involvement. In some instances an individual participated as a member of one committee and nothing else. Some faculty members participated individually as an advisor to a student organization and had no other involvement.

In these instances a Part I form (biographical information), a Part II (committee), or a Part III (individual participation) form were enclosed.

Other persons were sent a Part I form and two or more copies of the Part II and Part III forms applicable to their participation. In these instances the faculty members served on more than one committee or board, were involved in more than one area of student personnel work as an individual participant, or took part in both committee and individual activity.

There was a total of 1,268 persons who were designated by student personnel officers as faculty participants. Each of these nominees received a personal request for information and the initial letter brought in 898 questionnaires for a 70% response.

Sending the carbon copy

A carbon copy of the original letter had been prepared on the auto-typewriter and this was sent out with an additional copy of the questionnaire. The appropriate information for each person was once again indicated on the questionnaire: the name of the person, the name of the committee or board, and the student personnel service and individual involvement. Moreover, a special message was stamped at the top of the carbon copy of the original letter stating that this was being sent to the faculty member concerned as a reminder in the hope that the recipient would complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed stamped return envelope. This second request for assistance was sent to 370 persons who had not responded to the initial letter. The carbon copy mailing resulted in the return of

225 additional questionnaires.

Total response

A total of 1,123 persons responded to the two requests for information. This represented an 88% return. There were 159 questionnaires which were not used. They consisted of responses from those who were not faculty participants as defined, or were otherwise unsuitable for the purposes of the investigation.

Usable response

The number of completed questionnaires which were included in the final compilation of data totaled 964 of the original 1,268 sent to those persons who were designated as faculty participants by the student personnel officers of the five universities. The usable returns included in the study represented 75% of the total sample. These figures are listed in Table 2. The 964 usable responses include 111 faculty members who served on more than one committee or board or who were involved as an individual participant in more than one activity.

Treatment of the Data

The preceding two sections of this chapter have consisted of a review of the techniques used in collecting data pertaining to two different aspects: (1) the effectiveness of selected student personnel services and (2) the extent and nature of faculty participation found in these particular programs at five large public universities. The remainder of this chapter shall consist of the methods used in the classification, organization, and analysis of the data thus gathered.

TABLE 2

FACULTY PARTICIPATION QUESTIONNAIRES MAILED AND RETURNED

University	Original Letters	Letter Returns	Carbons Sent	Carbon Returns	Total Returns	Less Rejects	Total Usable Response
Illinois	321	239	82	40	279	32	247
Indiana	188	142	46	20	162	10	152
Michigan	219	158	61	35	193	46	147
Purdue	259	172	87	77	249	24	225
Wisconsin	281	187	94	53	240	47	193
	1,268	898	370	225	1,123	159	964
		(70%)*			(88%)*		(75%)*

---

*Represents percentage of returns to original 1,268 letters sent to faculty members.

Classification of data on faculty participation

The questionnaire which was used to collect data on the extent and nature of faculty participation consisted of three parts.[2] Each part was comprised of check-list interview items. Several questions in Parts II and III were designed to produce individual responses to certain items. Open-ended items allowed greater freedom of responses than did the forced choice question, but also such answers required coding into appropriate categories. All information was then recorded on computer cards by a key-punch operator for classification and analysis.

Biographical data on faculty participation

The Part I forms which were completed by each faculty participant identified the university and provided information on the academic rank, age, and sex of the respondent. These were analyzed by writing a computer program which yielded cross-classifications on the four items of the Part I biographical form with each of the seventy other categories of the three-part questionnaire on faculty participation.

Frequency distributions and percentages of response for all respondents were listed through use of a computer. The use of data processing equipment implemented greatly the construction of tables on those aspects which seemed pertinent to the investigation. *The results of this analysis are discussed in Chapters III and IV.*

---

[2] The questionnaire is included in the study as Appendix C.

Treatment of data on committee and board participation

A similar technique was followed for the organization, classification, and analysis of the Part II section of the questionnaire. The information was processed from questions which related to the extent and nature of faculty participation on committees and boards.[3] These were recorded in thirty-six computer card categories.

In addition to the cross-classification of categories with the data from Part I, supplemental information was obtained on the basis of issues discussed. *The issues were coded topically and appear in the study as Appendix D.*

Treatment of data on individual participation

Part III concerned the involvement of faculty members in non-committee activity. The method followed for analysis of the data on the extent and nature of individual participation consisted of cross-classification of items in Part I with answers to Part III of the questionnaire.[4] This information was key-punched into twenty-two card categories.

Scoring the Rackham Student Personnel Services Inventory

It has been previously stated that the Rackham Student Personnel Services Inventory was utilized to secure a measure of program effectiveness. This is a weighted rating scale for use by institutions of higher learning who wish to compare their services with that of an ideal program. Since it is a self-evaluation form the Rackham Inventory was completed by the student personnel officers in charge of the selected areas which are included in this study. This is the technique followed and recommended by Rackham for utilization of the check-list.[5] Moreover, several student personnel service officers were also used in the validation and revision of the Rackham Inventory by Hage.[6]

---

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

One departure from previous use of the Rackham Inventory should be noted. The weighted scale was not submitted to those filling out the section of the Rackham Inventory pertaining to their student personnel service. The investigator administered the check-list without the weighted scale so that the person completing the form would not be aware that some items were worth more than others on the inventory. The weighted scale was used to score the Rackham Inventory after the check-lists were completed by the student personnel officers. *The results of the application of the Rackham Student Personnel Services Inventory will be discussed in Chapter VI, and appear as Appendix A in the study.*

Analysis of faculty participation and program effectiveness

The relationship of faculty participation to program effectiveness was based on the findings of the three-part faculty participation questionnaire and the Rackham Student Personnel Services inventory. The eight student personnel services of each of the five universities were scored on the Rackham Inventory. These scores were then compared with quantitative measures of faculty participation.

---

[5] Rackham, *op. cit.*

[6] Hage, *op. cit.*

The technique utilized to analyze the relationship between these two key aspects of the investigation consisted of statistical computations. Pearson r product-moment correlations were made and the mean for both Rackham Inventory scores and selected measurements of faculty participation were computed. The results of these analyses will be discussed in Chapter VI.

CHAPTER III

THE EXTENT OF FACULTY PARTICIPATION

Review of the Study

In Chapter I the importance of the study was stated, the problem and hypotheses were set forth, and a review of the literature concerning faculty participation in the processes of policy determination, program implementation, and governance of colleges and universities was made. The instruments which had been developed for measurement of programs of student personnel services were also described. The procedures to be followed in conducting the investigation were outlined, limitations of the study were delineated, and terminology of the research was defined. Chapter II consisted of a presentation of the methods and techniques which were used in the study.

Explanation of faculty participation sample

In the discussion of methods and techniques of Chapter III it was stated that usable questionnaires had been returned by 964 faculty members. Because of multiple participation by these persons the total number of Part II and Part III forms (committee and individual involvement respectively) are greater than the number of respondents. Throughout the study the reader will find that there were 253 Part II forms used in the study and 837 Part III forms.

Tabulation of issues discussed by committees

Analysis of Part II forms provides information relative to the two most important issues discussed by committees in the selected areas of student personnel services with which this study was concerned. Since each committee or board member was asked to designate the two most important issues discussed by his group, the maximum number of issues was thus 506. Data concerning the two most important issues discussed by committees are presented in Chapter V.

Faculty Participation by University

In Table 3, opposite the student personnel services, are given the percentages of responses by university and by type of faculty participation. For instance, 15% of the committee members at Illinois reported that they served on committees which dealt with problems of "discipline" and 54% in the area of "organization and administration." Among individual participants, 69% at Illinois reported involvement in "extra-curricular activities" and 30% in "orientation." Above each column appear the total number of respondents for each university from which the percentages were derived.

Number of committee participants by area of student personnel service

The data indicate that most committee participation reported in the study was at Illinois which had eighty-nine respondents. The least number of committee members participating in the study among

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY AREA OF STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES AND TYPE OF PARTICIPATION

Area of student personnel services	Committee Participation N = 253					Individual Participation N = 837				
	Ill. N=89	Ind. N=32	Mich. N=17	Pur. N=35	Wis. N=80	Ill. N=196	Ind. N=153	Mich. N=129	Pur. N=216	Wis. N=143
Counseling	%	%	%	%	%	1%	%	%	10%	%
Discipline	15	13								
Extra-curricular activities	4	31	6		86	69	69	53	52	99
Financial aids	10	9	12	14						
Housing and board	1	3	53		5		29	17		
Organization and administration	54	38	24	69	3			30		
Orientation	10	6	6	11		30	1		21	1
Placement	6			6					17	1

the five universities was at Michigan which included only seventeen respondents.

Analysis of the data indicates that three of the five universities were concerned more frequently with aspects of "organization and administration" than with any other single area of student personnel service. Among the other individual services, four universities reported committee activity in "extra-curricular activities," "financial aids," "housing and board," and "orientation."

Those student personnel services which contained minimum committee participation included the following: not one university reported committee participation in the area of "counseling," and only two of the five universities had committee responses in the areas of "placement" and "discipline."

Number of individual participants by area of student personnel service

Findings reveal in Table 3 that Purdue had the highest number of individual faculty participation responses of the five universities with 216. The lowest number of individual faculty participation responses was at Michigan where the responses of 129 individual faculty participants were recorded.

The particular student personnel service which was expected to contain a high amount of individual participation was "extra-curricular activities." The tabulation of individual participation responses of the five universities bears out the validity of this prediction. There was substantially more participation in the "extra-curricular activities" area than in any of the other student personnel services. Observation of the data reveals that at Wisconsin 99% of the individual participation was reported in the "extra-curricular activities" area.

Conversely, no individual participation was discovered for any of the universities in either "discipline" or "financial aids." Only one university evidenced individual participation in the overall "organization and administration" of the program, while two of the five institutions had individual involvement in "counseling," "housing and board," and "placement."

Analysis of numbers of faculty members participating

It would appear from the data presented in Table 3 that faculty participation varies not only from one area of student personnel service to another, but also from one university to another. While certain services may lend themselves more readily to committee participation than others, there are evidently some areas which pertain to individual involvement of faculty members which are worth noting. It would appear in all instances that the student personnel officer must realize just where participation has been utilized to its greatest extent and where lack of participation is in evidence. Possibly it may be that there are jurisdictions within the program of student personnel services wherein the professional needs to perform his administrative responsibilities without recourse to assistance from the academic community.

The program of student personnel services was structured differently within each of the five universities. Although there were similarities in the size and public nature of each of the universities, it does not follow that there are identical policies and practices from one university to another. The organizational pattern of each university has been developed within an indigenous set of factors which have created the framework. Into this have been added the particular involvement of faculty members which has been found to represent understandable differences among the universities in amount and nature of faculty participation.

Faculty Participation by Academic Rank

Data were analyzed to show the academic rank of faculty participation both by committee members and individual participants. In Table 4 opposite the academic rank are given the percentages of faculty participants for the five respective universities. Table 4 may be interpreted in the following manner. Of the 89 committee members participating in the study from Illinois, 23% of them had the academic rank of "associate professor."

Academic rank of committee participants

Observation of the data reveals that the faculty participants who were appointed to committees and boards in the selected areas of student personnel services with which this study was concerned were predominantly the senior members of the faculty. The majority of committee members who responded were from the top two academic ranks--"professor" and "associate professor."

At each of the five universities the majority of faculty members were chosen from the upper two academic ranks. They were ranked either as a "professor" or as an "associate professor." The highest percentage of senior committee members was found at

TABLE 4

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY ACADEMIC RANK AND TYPE OF FACULTY PARTICIPATION

Academic Rank	Committee Participation N = 253					Individual Participation N = 837				
	Ill. N=89	Ind. N=32	Mich. N=17	Pur. N=35	Wis. N=80	Ill. N=196	Ind. N=153	Mich. N=129	Pur. N=216	Wis. N=143
Professor	70%	50%	41%	51%	55%	34%	24%	54%	28%	29%
Associate Professor	19	31	47	40	28	23	15	15	35	33
Assistant Professor	7	16	12	9	18	27	50	16	25	26
Instructor	3					15	8	5	10	9
Faculty Assistant	1	3				1	3	9	2	3

Purdue where 91% of the committee members responding were either "professor" or "associate professor." The smallest proportion of senior faculty members on committees was found at Indiana where 81% were from the upper two academic ranks.

In four of the universities no faculty participants in committee or board activity held an academic rank below that of "assistant professor." Only at Illinois were faculty members found to serve on committees from the lower two academic ranks--"instructor" and "faculty assistant." These ranks included only 4% of the respondents at that institution however.

As shown in Table 4, most faculty members were chosen from the upper levels of the academic community. The reasons for this may be many, but the important thing to note is that the procedure for selecting those who participate in the decision-making process seems to favor senior members of the faculty.

Academic rank of individual participants

A larger proportion of faculty from the lower academic ranks was found to participate individually than was found to be true of faculty participating in committee and board activity. As shown in Table 4, at each of the five universities there is a higher proportionate participation from the "assistant professor" than from the "associate professor" in individual non-committee activity. Exactly the opposite was the case in committee membership.

Policies and procedures are outlined by committees and boards which are predominantly staffed by senior faculty members who participate in greater proportion. Nevertheless, junior faculty members are involved in the implementation of the decisions made. Moreover, through the involvement of the junior members of the faculty the expertness is being created which will bring them to membership on boards and committees as they become senior members of the faculty.

There is still a strong representation of the senior faculty members outside of the committee structure however. In four of the five universities at least 60% of the participants in non-committee activity were senior faculty members. Only at Indiana, where 39% of the participation comes from senior faculty, does the individual participant represent less than half of those in the senior ranks.

Analysis of academic rank of faculty members participating

It would appear from Table 4 that in both committee work and in individual participation the senior faculty member predominates. The membership of committees and boards was found to consist predominantly of faculty members from the ranks of "professor" and "associate professor" and to represent the majority of those who participate individually.

When a committee or board member is selected, it is four times as likely that the person chosen will be taken from the senior two academic ranks of the faculty. It is also virtually certain that no one below the level of "assistant professor" will be chosen at all in 80% of the cases. A slightly better chance of participation exists individually in non-committee activity for the junior faculty member but he is still in the minority.

It would appear that a better consensus of faculty would be obtained by increasing the participation from the lower academic ranks. A greater percentage of junior faculty members participate individually rather than on committees. It is quite possible that many of the faculty members from the senior academic ranks who serve on committees do not represent a consensus of the faculty.

The exact proportion of senior and junior faculty members for each of the five universities was not readily available. Analysis of academic rank suggested however that differences among the academic ranks do exist between individual participation and committee participation.

Faculty Participation by Age

To determine the age distribution of faculty participants, each respondent was asked to check one of four categories relating to his age. Age data appear in Table 5. In columns under the respective universities for both committee members and individual participants are shown the percentages of responses for the different age categories. For example, it can be observed that at Indiana 50% of the committee participants and 20% of the individual participants are "over 50" years of age.

Age of committee participants

In each of the universities the combined responses of the senior faculty members in age categories of "41-50" and "over 50" years were in the majority. The participation of faculty members in these age groups represented a proportion of the total number of respondents which ranged from 65% at Michigan to 82% at Purdue.

TABLE 5

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY AGE AND TYPE OF FACULTY PARTICIPATION

Age category	Committee Participation N = 253					Individual Participation N = 837				
	Ill. N=89	Ind. N=32	Mich. N=17	Pur. N=35	Wis. N=80	Ill. N=196	Ind. N=153	Mich. N=129	Pur. N=216	Wis. N=143
Over 50	42%	50%	18%	51%	34%	24%	20%	39%	25%	24%
41-50	36	31	47	31	34	31	30	35	30	27
31-40	18	19	35	17	26	34	33	22	34	41
Under 30	4				6	12	17	5	11	8
$\overline{X}$	50.7	48.4	43.4	48.5	50.4	37.0	43.6	44.4	41.8	42.0

It can be observed that in three of the universities there was no participation by faculty members "under 30" and only 4% and 6% respectively in this age category were reported from the other two universities.

The difference between academic rank and age distribution of committee members appears to be slight. Comparison of these two factors however reveals that more attention is given to involvement of faculty members who have advanced academic rank than those who are senior members because of longevity. This is true at each of the universities since it can be observed from Table 4 that there is a greater proportion of committee participation in the senior two academic ranks than in the senior two age categories of Table 5. The mean age of committee members was 48.2 years.

Age of individual participants

The age of faculty members who participated individually in non-committee activities was also skewed toward the senior faculty members. In three of the five universities there were more individual participants from the age categories of "41-50" and "over 50" than in the two younger classifications. However, in two universities the distribution of individual participants was about equally divided between the upper and lower two age categories. At Indiana and Wisconsin 50% and 51% of the participants in non-committee activities were from the senior two age categories.

When comparing the age distribution of individual participants with that of the academic rank, it appears that the pattern is not as clear as it is in committee participation. While faculty members participating on committees and boards were predominantly from the upper categories of age and academic ranks, as shown in Tables 4 and 5, those participating individually tended to be more widely spread in both age and rank.

Analysis of age of faculty participants

The information in Table 5 reveals that there is a tendency to appoint experienced faculty members to committees and boards relating to the selected student personnel services of the investigation. The majority of participants are from the older two age categories. When comparing age and academic rank however it appears that a higher percentage of faculty participants was from the upper academic ranks than was from the senior age categories; the senior faculty members, of both age and academic rank, were represented by substantial majorities at each of the universities.

While committee members seem to predominantly possess senior academic status and are from the older two academic categories, there is a tendency for younger participants to be better represented in individual activities. There is still greater involvement of older faculty members than younger ones as individual participants. The tendency however is to have senior faculty members (average age 48.2) sit on committees and to involve slightly younger persons (average age 41.7) individually.

Amount of Monthly Participation

Hours spent per month on committee activity

Committee members were asked how many hours per month (average) they spent on committee or board activity during the last year. Data in Table 6 show that a larger percentage of faculty members participated in committee work from "one to four" hours than for any other period of time. Percentages of respondents participating from "one to four" hours were 45%, 53%, 47%, 54%, and 53% respectively in the five universities.

Differences were noted among the universities in the average amount of time spent monthly in committee work. The mean amount of time spent by committee participants for the five universities was 6.0 hours per month. The mean of monthly participation on an hourly basis in committee work for each university was as follows: Illinois 7.8; Indiana 7.3; Michigan 6.2; Purdue 4.3; Wisconsin 4.6.

Hours spent per month in committee meetings

Committee members were asked of the time spent on committee activity how much of it was spent in committee meetings in (average) hours per month. The data pertaining to time spent in committee meetings, as shown in Table 6, indicate that at Illinois 69% of the respondents served from "five to nine" hours in meetings per month. At Indiana 75% of the committee members reported meetings took only "one to four" hours per month. At Purdue 69% of the committee respondents indicated participation in committee meetings of "one to four" hours per month. The mean number of hours per month that

TABLE 6

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY HOURS AND TYPE OF MONTHLY COMMITTEE PARTICIPATION

Number of hours	Hours per month on committee work N = 253					Hours per month in committee meetings N = 837				
	Ill. N=89	Ind. N=32	Mich. N=17	Pur. N=35	Wis. N=80	Ill. N=196	Ind. N=153	Mich. N=129	Pur. N=216	Wis. N=143
No response	%	%	6%	%	4%	%	%	6%	%	6%
Less than one	6	3		17	15	20	16	18	23	24
One to four	45	53	47	54	53	1	75	35	69	56
Five to nine	21	28	18	17	15	69	9	24	9	10
Ten to fourteen	16	6	24	6	6			12		3
Fifteen to nineteen	3		6	6	3	8		6		1
Twenty to twenty four	2	3			3					
Twenty-five to twenty nine	3									
Thirty to thirty-four					1					
Thirty-five or more	3	6				2				
$\overline{X}$	7.8	7.3	6.2	4.3	4.6	7.2	2.3	5.0	2.4	2.7

faculty members participated in committee meetings at each university were as follows: Illinois 7.2; Indiana 2.3; Michigan 5.0; Purdue 2.4; and Wisconsin 2.7.

Analysis of amount of monthly committee participation

Data found in Table 6 indicate that the largest percentage of committee participants spent nine hours or less per month in both committee meetings and other committee work. There is a difference between the amount of time spent on committee work in general (mean 6.0 hours) and in the time spent at meetings in particular (mean 3.9 hours) in all the universities. Approximately 40% of the time spent on committee activity is taken up with work in preparation for or as a result of committee meetings.

Hours spent per month in individual (non-committee) participation

Individual participants were asked how many hours (average) per month were spent in non-committee activity. The findings shown in Table 7 reveal that the largest percentage of individual faculty participation involved nine hours or less per month. The time checked by the largest percentage of individual respondents at the respective universities was "one to four" hours. Percentages of faculty indicating "one to four" hours were 29%, 43%, 35%, 31%, and 42% for individual participants. Interestingly, the percentage of combined respondents spending five to fourteen hours per month nearly equalled the percentage spending "one to four" hours. Percentages of faculty members spending five to fourteen hours among the universities were 31%, 33%, 37%, 33%, and 38%. Therefore, the

TABLE 7

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY HOURS AND FREQUENCY OF MONTHLY INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPATION

Number of hours or frequency	Hours spent per month in individual (non-committee) participation N = 253					Frequency of monthly individual (non-committee) participation N = 837				
	Ill. N=89	Ind. N=32	Mich. N=17	Pur. N=35	Wis. N=80	Ill. N=196	Ind. N=153	Mich. N=129	Pur. N=216	Wis. N=143
No response	2%	5%	2%	%	5%	2%	5%	2%	1%	5%
Less than one	21	10	12	15	6	24	10	14	16	6
One to four	29	43	35	31	42	39	58	45	38	61
Five to nine	18	23	22	20	29	20	18	18	18	17
Ten to fourteen	13	11	15	13	9	6	7	3	12	7
Fifteen to nineteen	7	2	5	7	3	1	1	5	4	1
Twenty to twenty-four	4	5	2	6	3	4	1	5	4	
Twenty-five to twenty-nine	2			3	2	1		1	1	1
Thirty to thirty-four	1	1	2					1	1	
Thirty-five or more	5		6	4	1	5	1	5	4	1
$\overline{X}$	8.0	5.7	8.3	8.9	6.2	6.1	4.2	7.6	7.6	4.5

percentages of individual faculty participants who spent from one to fourteen hours per month were 60%, 76%, 72%, 64%, and 80% in the five universities. The mean number of hours spent per month in individual participation was 7.4.

Monthly frequency of individual participation

Individual participants were asked the number of times they were involved (average) per month in non-committee activity. The responses as shown in Table 7 for frequency of individual participation were clustered about the "one to four" hours per month category. The percentages of individual participants who spent from "one to five" hours per month were 39%, 58%, 45%, 38%, and 61% in the five universities. The mean times per month of the frequency of participation in non-committee activity was 5.9 times.

Analysis of hours and frequency of individual participation

The data indicate that even more hours per month are spent by faculty members in individual participation than in committee work. Individual participants spent an average of 7.4 hours per month while committee members spent an average of 6.0 hours per month. Individually, faculty members seem to participate on an average of nearly six times per month thus spreading their participation to an average of a little less than an hour on a given occasion.

Individual participation, and that of committee work and attendance at meetings, can represent a meaningful service to the student, to the faculty member and to the individual in charge of the particular area of service if the time is spent productively.

Whether or not this is accomplished in the majority of instances, the participation of faculty members represents time away from the classroom which should be supplemental to the academic program and rewarding to both the instructional staff member and to the recipient.

CHAPTER IV

THE NATURE OF FACULTY PARTICIPATION

The nature of faculty participation consisted of attitudes and opinions of those who either served on committees and boards or who were involved individually in the student personnel services. The nature of faculty participation will be presented in this chapter.

Effectiveness of Faculty Participation

In order to determine whether faculty members felt the committee on which they served was effective, each respondent was asked to rate the effectiveness of the committee in helping to fulfill the aims and objectives of the related area of student personnel work. In Table 8, opposite the responses received from committee members and under the university for which the frequency distribution was obtained, appear the percentages of committee responses as they relate to committee effectiveness. For example, 36% of the responding committee members at Illinois rated the committee on which they served as "greatly effective," and 52% rated it "moderately effective."

In order to determine the personal effectiveness of faculty members who participated individually in student personnel services, those who were actively involved were asked how effective their individual contribution was in helping to fulfill the aims and objectives of the area of student personnel work concerned. The data reveal that 19% of the individual participants at Illinois

TABLE 8

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY REPORTED EFFECTIVENESS AND TYPE OF FACULTY PARTICIPATION

Effectiveness rating	Committee Participation N = 253					Individual Participation N = 837				
	Ill. N=89	Ind. N=32	Mich. N=17	Pur. N=35	Wis. N=80	Ill. N=196	Ind. N=153	Mich. N=129	Pur. N=216	Wis. N=143
No response	4%	3%	%	3%	8%	3%	%	4%	1%	2%
Greatly effective	36	44	29	11	38	19	9	20	17	20
Moderately effective	52	47	65	63	50	55	63	57	69	62
Neutral	3	3	6	11	3	15	14	17	6	13
Ineffective	3			3	1	2	5	1	1	1
Extremely ineffective	1	3		9	1	2	3		2	1
Cannot evaluate						6	6	2	3	2

rated their personal contribution as "greatly effective," and 55% rated it as "moderately effective." The remainder of Table 8 is to be interpreted in a similar fashion.

Effectiveness of committee participation

By viewing Table 8 one can see that the percentages of committee respondents rating the work of the committee as "moderately effective" were 52%, 47%, 65%, 63%, and 50% at the respective universities. The two most positive ratings of "greatly effective" or "moderately effective" were given by 88%, 91%, 94%, 74%, and 88% of committee respondents at the five universities. However, it appears that a larger percentage of committee members felt that committees were "moderately effective" rather than "greatly effective."

Effectiveness of individual participation

By observing Table 8 it can be seen that individual respondents rate their personal effectiveness as "moderately effective," or "greatly effective" in instances of 74%, 72%, 77%, 86%, and 82% respectively in the universities. As in committee participation, a higher percentage of individual respondents checked the "moderately effective" rather than the "greatly effective" category. Individual participation effectiveness at Purdue alone was rated higher than was committee effectiveness. While 86% of individual respondents rated their participation as either "greatly" or "moderately" effective, 74% of committee respondents rated the effectiveness of their committee this way. At each of the other four universities there was a slightly higher rating of committee effectiveness than for individual participation effectiveness.

Analysis of effectiveness of faculty participation

Although data found in Table 8 reveal that both committee members and individual participants rate their effectiveness positively, a higher percentage chose "moderately effective" rather than "greatly effective." There does not appear to be complete satisfaction on the part of faculty respondents with the effectiveness of their participation.

Reason for Effectiveness

Reason given for effectiveness of committees

Respondents were asked to indicate which of several reasons explained why they felt the way they did about the effectiveness of their committee in helping to fulfill the aims and objectives of a particular area of student personnel work. One can observe in Table 9 that positive reasons indicated most often by committee respondents for committee effectiveness were that "important topics were discussed," that "most recommendations were implemented," or that a "combination of both" reasons applied.

Observation of Table 9 reveals that positive reasons for committee effectiveness were reported by 81%, 82%, 89%, 63%, and 78% of the committee respondents in each of the five universities. For instance, at Illinois 19% of the committee members indicated

TABLE 9

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY REASON REPORTED FOR COMMITTEE EFFECTIVENESS

Reasons for effectiveness of committee	Committee Participation N = 253				
	Ill. N=89	Ind. N=32	Mich. N=17	Pur. N=35	Wis. N=80
No response	6%	6%	6%	9%	16%
Important topics discussed (1)	19	28	12	14	21
Most recommendations implemented (2)	22	16	12	20	23
Recommendations ignored (3)	1				1
Too much time on busy work (4)	7	3		9	
Topics should be referred to experts (5)	1			6	1
Combination of 1-2	40	38	65	29	34
Combination of 3-4-5	1	6		9	
Other	2	3	6	6	4

"important topics were discussed," 22% reported that "most recommendations were implemented," and 40% gave both of these reasons.

Negative reasons were given to explain why committee respondents felt the way they did about committee effectiveness by a minority of respondents at each of the universities. Percentages of committee members in the respective universities citing negative reasons such as "recommendations were ignored," "too much time spent on busy work," "topics should be referred to experts," or a "combination" of these reasons were 10%, 9%, 0%, 24%, and 6%.

Reason given for effectiveness of individual participation

Reasons for the effectiveness of individual faculty participation were determined by asking each respondent to state why he felt the way he did about the effectiveness of his contribution in helping to fulfill the aims and objectives of the student personnel service in which he was participating. It can be seen in Table 10 that the highest percentage of individual participants gave as their reason that their "ideas, experience, and information helped." Percentages of respondents indicating such a reason were 23%, 22%, 22%, 18% and 27% in the universities respectively.

In the positive categories, "goals accomplished or achievements made" and "student interest or participation high," the responses of individual faculty participants were 28%, 13%, 27%, 32%, and 18% in the five institutions. In negative categories, "unable to communicate with students" and "insufficient interest or participation," the responses from faculty participants relative to

TABLE 10

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES BY REASON REPORTED FOR PERSONAL EFFECTIVENESS IN INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPATION

Reasons for effectiveness of individual participation	Individual Participation N = 837				
	Ill. N=196	Ind. N=153	Mich. N=129	Pur. N=216	Wis. N=143
No response	10%	17%	12%	14%	14%
Goals accomplished or achievements made	14	10	14	12	6
Student interest or participation high	14	3	13	20	12
Scholarship enhanced	3	2	7	5	1
Opportunity for faculty student dialogue	3	4		1	3
My ideas, experience & information helped	23	22	22	18	27
Unable to communicate with students	9	9	15	8	17
Insufficient interest or participation	17	27	12	12	16
Cannot evaluate	5	5	2	8	3
Other	3	1	2	1	1

the reasons for individual effectiveness were found to be 26%, 36%, 27%, 20%, and 33% in the five universities.

Analysis of reasons given for effectiveness of faculty participation

There appears to be a higher percentage of positive reasons given by respondents for committee effectiveness than for effectiveness of individual participation. Among individual participants the reason most often given to explain why they felt the way they did about their personal effectiveness was that their "ideas, experience and information helped."

Sources of Appreciation

To determine the source and amount of appreciation and encouragement which was felt by faculty participants for their services to committees and for individual non-committee activity, each faculty respondent was asked whether he felt that appreciation and encouragement for him to continue to participate in this area was exhibited by each of several listed sources. The various sources listed were "colleagues," "superior," "students," "administration," and "self-satisfaction." The findings relative to sources of appreciation appear in Table 11.

In Table 11, opposite the various sources of appreciation, are the percentages of committee and individual participant responses by university. It can be observed, for example, that at Illinois 49% of the committee respondents indicated that "colleagues" were a source of appreciation for participation. Among individual participants 57% at Illinois reported that the "superior" was a source of appreciation for continued participation. The remainder of the table can be read in a similar manner.

Sources of appreciation for committee participation

One can observe in Table 11 that a minority of faculty members indicated that their "colleagues" were a source of appreciation for committee participation. Percentages of committee participants indicating "colleagues" as a source of appreciation were 49%, 31%, 47%, 26%, and 35% among the five universities. Committee members who indicated that "colleagues" were not a source of appreciation for committee participation were 6%, 13%, 18%, 20%, and 13% in the respective universities.

Committee respondents who indicated that the "superior" was a source of appreciation for committee participation, although in the minority, represented 43%, 25%, 47%, 29%, and 33% at the respective universities. Of respondents participating on committees 38%, 41%, 76%, 34%, and 41% in their respective universities indicated that "students" were a source of appreciation. At Purdue 14% and 17% respectively of the committee respondents reported that "students" and "superior" were not a source of appreciation.

It can be observed in Table 11 that at three universities a majority of committee members reported that the "administration" was a source of appreciation for their participation. At Wisconsin a little less than half of the committee respondents felt that the "administration" was a source of appreciation.

TABLE 11

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY SOURCE OF APPRECIATION AND TYPE OF PARTICIPATION*

Source of Appre-ciation	Committee Participation N - 253					Individual Participation N - 837				
	Ill. N-89	Ind. N-32	Mich. N-17	Pur. N-35	Wis. N-80	Ill. N-196	Ind. N-153	Mich. N-129	Pur. N-216	Wis. N-143
Colleague										
Yes	49%	31%	47%	26%	35%	49%	36%	55%	48%	53%
No	6	13	18	20	13	33	35	20	26	25
Superior										
Yes	43	25	47	29	33	57	42	58	63	55
No	9	6	12	17	10	24	28	17	18	17
Students										
Yes	38	41	76	34	41	84	80	90	88	91
No	7	6	6	14	8	8	8	4	5	3
Administration										
Yes	58	59	71	40	51	48	52	53	54	48
No	6	3		11	5	25	16	13	21	20
Self-Satisfaction										
Yes	75	59	76	63	66	77	69	68	83	73
No	2			14	4	9	12	6	5	10

*Percentages totalling more than 100% occur because some participants rated more than one source of appreciation as yes or no.

Analysis of Table 11 indicates that a high percentage of committee respondents reported "self-satisfaction" as a source of appreciation for continued participation. Committee members who reported "self-satisfaction" were 75%, 59%, 76%, 63%, and 66% of the total. At Purdue 14% of the committee respondents reported that "self-satisfaction" was not a source of appreciation for committee participation.

Sources of appreciation for individual participation

Data in Table 11 show that a higher percentage of individual participants indicated that their "colleagues" were a source of appreciation for their involvement than did committee participants. "Colleagues" were cited as a source of appreciation by individual participants by 49%, 36%, 55%, 48%, and 53% at the five universities. A higher percentage of individual participants than committee members also indicated that their "colleagues" were not a source of appreciation for their involvement. Individual respondents who indicated that "colleagues" were not a source of appreciation for participation were 33%, 35%, 20%, 26%, and 25% in the five universities.

One can observe in Table 11 that a higher percentage of individual respondents indicated that their "superior" was a source of appreciation for personal involvement than was reported by committee respondents. Those who indicated this were 57%, 42%, 58%, 63%, and 55% in the five universities. A slightly higher proportion of individual participants indicated that "superiors" were not a source of appreciation than did committee respondents. It seems that the "superior" is more likely to indicate both approval and disapproval for individual participation than was the case for committee participation.

The percentages of respondents who reported that "students" were a source of appreciation for individual participation was about twice as high as that reported by committee participants. Individual respondents reporting that "students" were a source of appreciation were 84%, 80%, 90%, 88%, and 91% in the five universities.

One can observe in Table 11 that fewer individuals indicated "administration" as a source of appreciation than did committee participants. There was a higher proportion of individual participants indicating that "administration" was not a source of appreciation than was reported by committee respondents. Individual participants who reported that the "administration" was not a source of appreciation were 25%, 16%, 13%, 21%, and 20% at the respective universities.

The data in Table 11 reveal that in four of the universities there was an even higher percentage of individual participants who indicated that "self-satisfaction" was a source of appreciation for participation than was reported by committee respondents. Individual participants who identified "self-satisfaction" as a source were 77%, 69%, 68%, 83%, and 73% in the respective universities. At Indiana 12% of the individual respondents reported that "self-satisfaction" was not a source of appreciation for participation.

Analysis of sources of appreciation

A slightly higher percentage of individual participants than committee members indicated that their "colleagues" were a source of appreciation for their continued participation. A higher percentage of individual participants than committee respondents reported that the "superior" was a source of appreciation for their participation. Of the various sources of appreciation for both types of participation, the highest percentages were reported by individual respondents for "students." Nearly nine out of ten individual respondents reported that "students" were a source of appreciation. At four of the universities twice the percentage of individual participants rated "students" as a source of appreciation as did committee respondents. The "administration" was reported as the source of appreciation by a higher percentage of individual participants than committee respondents in four of the five universities. "Self-satisfaction" was indicated as the source of appreciation by significant percentages for both committee and individual respondents.

Willingness to Serve or Participate Again

To determine the willingness of faculty participants to continue to participate as members of committees or as individual participants, respondents were asked if they were invited to serve again would they agree to do so. In Table 12, opposite the "yes" and "no" categories designating willingness to serve again, are given the percentages of responses by university and type of participation. It can be seen that at Illinois 90% of the committee respondents and 90% of the individual respondents indicated willingness to participate again if asked.

Willingness to serve on committee again

The findings of Table 12 reveal an overwhelming positive response from committee members indicating willingness to serve again if asked. About nine out of ten committee members expressed a willingness to serve again. The percentages of committee members who answered affirmatively were 90%, 88%, 88%, 89%, and 93% in the respective universities. There was a small percentage of respondents who did not respond.

TABLE 12

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY WILLINGNESS TO SERVE OR PARTICIPATE AGAIN AND TYPE OF FACULTY PARTICIPATION

Will Serve Again?	Committee Participation N = 253					Individual Participation N = 837				
	Ill.	Ind.	Mich.	Pur.	Wis.	Ill.	Ind.	Mich.	Pur.	Wis.
No response	2%	3%	%	3%	4%	4%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Yes	90	88	88	89	93	90	86	93	94	92
No	8	9	12	9	4	7	12	5	4	6
Total Sample (N)	89	32	17	35	80	196	153	129	216	143

Willingness to participate individually again

It can be seen in Table 12 that a higher percentage of individual participants than committee members reported willingness to participate again if asked. Their "yes" responses were 90%, 86%, 93%, 94%, and 92% at the respective universities. A very small proportion of the individual respondents indicated they would not participate again if asked.

Analysis of willingness to serve or participate again

The findings of Table 12 show that a large percentage of faculty members indicated their willingness to serve on university committees or to participate again individually if asked. The high percentage of willingness to participate is consistent with the results of Table 11. In Table 11 it was shown that there is a high percentage of "self-satisfaction" as a source of appreciation among committee and individual participants. It appears that faculty participants involved in student personnel services are convinced that there is sufficient justification for their continued participation.

Attitude of University Toward the Student

Both committee members and individual participants were asked about the attitude of the university toward the student. In Table 13, opposite the university attitude, are shown the percentages of responses by university and type of faculty participation. It can be observed that at Purdue 31% of the committee members and 31% of the individual participants reported that the attitude of the university was "paternalistic." The remainder of the Table is to be interpreted in a similar fashion.

University attitude according to committee members

One can observe by examining Table 13 that the category checked in the majority by committee members as the university attitude toward students was a combination of "both" paternalistic and permissive at Illinois by 57% of the committee respondents and by 53% at Indiana. These two attitudes were indicated as the attitude of the university toward students by 41% of the committee respondents at Michigan and by 44% at Wisconsin. At Purdue 31% of the committee respondents chose "paternalistic" as the university attitude toward students. Among committee members there were 17% at Purdue who classified the attitude of the university toward students as one of "interest and concern" as did 20% at Wisconsin.

Personal notations designating exceptions to the terminology were numerous for this particular question; however, only a small percentage of committee respondents did not answer the question about university attitude. Percentages of committee respondents checking "paternalistic," "permissive," or "both" paternalistic and permissive, were 81%, 94%, 94%, 63%, and 63% at the respective universities.

University attitude according to individual participants

The findings of Table 13 reveal that 50% of the individual respondents at Wisconsin and 39% at Michigan indicated the university attitude toward students was "permissive." At Indiana 35% of the individual respondents checked "both" paternalistic and permissive, and at Illinois this category was indicated by 35%. Purdue, with 31%, had the largest percentage of committee members who indicated

TABLE 13

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY ATTITUDE OF UNIVERSITY TOWARD STUDENTS AND TYPE OF FACULTY PARTICIPATION

University attitude toward student	Committee Participation N = 253					Individual Participation N = 837				
	Ill. N=89	Ind. N=32	Mich. N=17	Pur. N=35	Wis. N=80	Ill. N=196	Ind. N=153	Mich. N=129	Pur. N=216	Wis. N=143
No response	6%	3%	%	9%	11%	7%	8%	4%	5%	3%
Paternalistic	17	16	12	31	1	18	19	5	31	6
Permissive	7	25	41	3	44	17	26	39	19	50
Both	57	53	41	29	18	34	35	34	29	21
Depends on individual or function	3					2		2		1
No single attitude	2		6	6	3	3	1	2	1	3
Interest and concern	6			17	20	6	9	7	8	8
Indifferent				6		7	1	4	4	3
Cannot answer	2				1	4		2		2
Other		3			3	3	1	2	2	3

"both" paternalistic and permissive as the university attitude. In the "permissive" category Wisconsin respondents checked this 50% of the time, and Michigan respondents chose this as the university attitude by 39%. All other categories in which individual participants indicated a university attitude were less than 10% of the responses. Individual respondents who checked either "paternalistic," "permissive," or "both" were 69%, 80%, 78%, 79%, and 77% at the five universities.

Analysis of university attitude toward the student

Although many committee and individual participants indicated that they could not be sure what the university attitude was, they nevertheless decided in the majority of cases that "paternalistic," "permissive," or "both" categories were more representative of the attitude of the university toward the student than some other attitude they could name themselves. Examination of Table 13 reveals that, in both types of participation, the university attitude toward students chosen more often than any other was a combination of "both" paternalistic and permissive. The university appeared protective in some instances while in others it could be quite liberal in attitude toward a student. When the "paternalistic" category is analyzed one can note that more faculty participants from Purdue indicated this as representative of the university attitude than was the case at the other universities. This is true for both committee and individual respondents. In the "permissive" category Wisconsin participants of both types indicated this as the university attitude, while Michigan had the second highest percentage both among committee and individual participants.

Preferred Source for Recruiting Student Personnel Officers

To determine the preferred source for recruiting student personnel officers, faculty participants were asked to designate the source which they preferred for recruiting new student personnel officers. Table 14 data show the percentages of responses opposite the source preferred by university and type of faculty participation. For instance, at Illinois it can be seen that 20% of the committee respondents and 52% of the individual participants prefer that new student personnel officers be recruited from "instructional staff."

Preferred source by committee members for recruiting new student personnel officers

Observation of the data in Table 14 reveals that committee members at three of the universities preferred "professionally trained workers" as the primary source for recruiting new student personnel officers. "Professionally trained workers" was the choice of 33% of the committee respondents at Illinois, of 41% of the committee members at Purdue, and of 39% of the committee respondents at Wisconsin. At Michigan 35% of the committee respondents, and 31% of those at Purdue, preferred "instructional staff."

The third source preferred by committee respondents for recruiting new student personnel officers, as indicated in Table 14, was that combining "both" professionally trained workers and instructional staff together as a single source. Such a combination was indicated by one-fourth of the committee respondents at Indiana. Together, the three most preferred sources for recruiting student

TABLE 14

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY PREFERRED SOURCE FOR RECRUITING STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES AND TYPE OF FACULTY PARTICIPATION

Source of recruitment for student personnel officers	Committee Participation N = 253					Individual Participation N = 837				
	Ill. N=89	Ind. N=32	Mich. N=17	Pur. N=35	Wis. N=80	Ill. N=196	Ind. N=153	Mich. N=129	Pur. N=216	Wis. N=143
No response	10%	6%	%	11%	20%	12%	15%	5%	9%	10%
Instructional staff	20	22	35	31	18	52	33	50	49	48
Professionally trained workers	33	41	24	20	39	15	29	20	18	17
Both	17	25	18	14	15	6	6	6	11	6
Most qualified person	4	3		6	1	3	5	3	1	
No single source	3		6	9	3	1				4
Instructional staff with additional training	4		6					2		1
Professionally trained with teaching experience	3				1			2		
Concerned or interested people			6			1	2	2	4	4
Did not understand term	4	3	6	9	4	11	10	9	9	9

personnel officers ("professionally trained workers," "instructional staff," and "both") accounted for a high proportion of the committee responses as seen in the distribution of 70%, 88%, 77%, 65%, and 72% in Table 14. At Wisconsin one-fifth of the committee members did not respond to this question.

Preferred source by individual participants for recruiting new student personnel officers

Data in Table 14 indicate that "instructional staff" was the most preferred source for recruiting new student personnel officers by individual participants. Percentages were 52%, 33%, 50%, 49%, and 48% of those who preferred this category among the individual participants responding. Next in frequency was the source of "professionally trained workers," as indicated by 29% of the individual respondents at Indiana. One out of three individual respondents did not understand the question.

Analysis of preferred source for recruiting student personnel officers

According to the data found in Table 14, committee members at three of the five universities preferred that student personnel officers be recruited from the ranks of "professionally trained workers." Individual respondents at each of the universities however preferred "instructional staff" as the source for recruiting new student personnel officers.

CHAPTER V

IMPORTANT ISSUES DISCUSSED BY COMMITTEES

To determine what subjects were discussed by committees relating to the student personnel services which were selected for this study, each committee respondent was asked to express an opinion as to the two most important issues or subjects discussed by the committee or board on which he served. In addition, respondents were asked to identify each issue, what recommendations were made, to whom recommendations were made, what action was taken on each recommendation, and what was the preferred action that should have taken place on each issue. Respondents were also asked to indicate the nature and significance of each issue, and to give their reasons why they considered each issue to be significant or insignificant. The findings in this chapter pertain only to committee participation. Individual involvement is not discussed in this chapter.

Important Issues Discussed by Student Personnel Service

In Table 15, opposite student personnel services and under the university, are shown the percentages of committee responses by the two most important issues discussed. For instance, at Purdue 74% of the committee respondents reported that Issue A (the first issue discussed) and 66% of the committee respondents reported that Issue B (the second issue discussed) were concerned with "organization and administration." The remainder of the table can be read in a similar manner. At Indiana 56% of the committee respondents reported that Issue A was concerned with "organization and administration " and at Illinois 12% of the committee respondents reported Issue B was concerned with "discipline."

Student personnel services represented--Issue A

It can be observed in Table 15 that committee members reported Issue A in the area of "organization and administration" more frequently than in any other student personnel service. Issue A was the first issue or subject reported by committee respondents.

Purdue, with 74%, had the highest proportion of committee respondents who indicated that Issue A subjects were concerned with "organization and administration." At Indiana 56%, and at Illinois 52% of the committee respondents reported that Issue A subjects were concerned with "organization and administration." At Illinois 15% of the respondents indicated that their committee discussed discipline in Issue A. At Michigan 47% reported that "organization and administration" aspects were discussed in Issue A while 18% of the committee respondents reported "orientation." At Wisconsin 39% indicated "organization and administration" problems were discussed in Issue A, while 18% indicated "financial aids," and 15% reported "extracurricular activities" for Issue A. Thus, each university reported

TABLE 15

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES REPRESENTED FOR TWO MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES DISCUSSED

Student personnel service	Issue A N = 253					Issue B N = 253				
	Ill. N=89	Ind. N=32	Mich. N=17	Pur. N=35	Wis. N=80	Ill. N=89	Ind. N=32	Mich. N=17	Pur. N=35	Wis. N=80
No response	2%	3%	6%	6%	8%	10%	25%	6%	17%	29%
Counseling		3					6			
Discipline	15	9			6	12	9			5
Extra-curricular	7	9	12		15	8	6	12		11
Financial aid	9	9	12	9	18	8	9	12	3	10
Housing	1	3			11	1	3		3	10
Organization and administration	52	56	47	74	39	47	41	47	66	34
Orientation	10	6	18	11		9		18	11	
Placement	4		6		4	4		6		1

a strong percentage of discussion topics in the area of "organization and administration" for Issue A even though a significant percentage of the responses was classified in other student personnel services at each of the universities. The one exception was Purdue which had very little response on the part of committee members outside of "organization and administration" for Issue A.

Student personnel services represented--Issue B

Analysis of Table 15 reveals that committee respondents reported that Issue B was concerned with "organization and administration" more frequently than any other student personnel service. Issue B represents the second issue or subject reported by committee respondents.

It can be seen in Table 15 that Purdue with 66% had the highest proportion of committee respondents who indicated that Issue B subjects were in the area of "organization and administration." Committee respondents at the four other universities reported "organization and administration" as the Issue B discussion subject as follows: Illinois 47%, Michigan 47%, Indiana 41%, and Wisconsin 34%. "Organization and administration" accounted for more Issue B responses in each of the five universities than did any other student personnel service. At least one out of four committee respondents did not designate that a second issue was discussed at Indiana and Wisconsin. One should note that in those instances where no second issue was reported there can be no recommendation, action taken, etc. The reader should keep this in mind while reading this chapter.

Analysis of student personnel services represented by Issue A and Issue B

As shown in Table 15, the majority of issues or problems reported by committee respondents for both Issue A and Issue B were designated as "organization and administration." After the "organization and administration" area it would appear that "financial aid," "extra-curricular activities," and "orientation" were taken up as discussion subjects more frequently than any other student personnel service.

Topical Listing of Issues

The classification of issues according to topics discussed is a supplement to the information previously presented on the distribution of issues by area of student personnel service. The number of committees which discussed various topics was determined by coding the issues or subjects reported by committee members. *The numerical listing of topical issues appears in Appendix D of this investigation.* Only those topics which were reported for at least five different committees were included in this listing of topics discussed. By reviewing this section of the investigation one can better understand the frequency with which committees were concerned with particicular topics of discussion. For instance, among Issue A topics it was reported by committee respondents that twelve committees discussed the "selection of financial aid recipients." Among Issue B topics five committees discussed the "selection of financial aid recipients."

Committee Recommendations Made

Analysis of committee recommendations was accomplished by asking committee respondents to state what recommendation was made regarding each issue or subject discussed. Table 16 contains the percentage distribution of various committee recommendations by the two issues discussed according to university. Issue A was the first issue or subject discussed and Issue B was the second issue or subject discussed by a committee.

Committee recommendations--Issue A

The data in Table 16 indicate that a majority of committee recommendations for Issue A were positively referred. That is, recommendations were reported by committee respondents as "approved," "recommended," or "put into effect," collectively by 73%, 57%, 84%, 66%, and 69% of the total responses.

A majority of committee respondents at Michigan, with 72%, indicated that Issue A was "recommended," this was indicated by 59% at Wisconsin and 58% at Illinois. Committee recommendations usually represent an endorsement or suggestion for solving a problem with the understanding that their opinion will be taken into consideration during the administrative implementation of the decision. Purdue committee respondents reported 49% of Issue A subjects were in the "recommended" category, while the percentage for Indiana respondents was 19%. Indiana also had the highest percentage of "no response" with 28%. At Wisconsin, 14% of the committee respondents did not indicate any committee recommendation for Issue A. In addition to the "recommended" and the "no response" categories,

TABLE 16

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE FOR TWO MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES DISCUSSED

Recommendations	Issue A N = 253					Issue B N = 253				
	Ill. N=89	Ind. N=32	Mich. N=17	Pur. N=35	Wis. N=80	Ill. N=89	Ind. N=32	Mich. N=17	Pur. N=35	Wis. N=80
No response	6%	28%	12%	6%	14%	13%	38%	12%	23%	31%
Approved	8	22		11	1	4	13		6	1
Recommended	58	19	72	49	59	46	22	53	43	46
Autonomous	4			6	1	3			3	
Under study	2	6		6	4	7	9	6	3	9
Disapproved	4	3		6	4	7	6		3	
Put into effect	7	16	12	6	9	12	6	6	9	6
No action necessary	2	3	6	3	1	1		6	3	1
No action yet	2	3		3	5	4	3	12	9	5
No solution	6			6	3	1	3	6		

significant percentages for favorable reception of subjects discussed were indicated by 22% at Indiana who reported that Issue A was "approved," and by 16% who indicated that the recommendation was "put into effect."

Committee recommendations--Issue B

The data found in Table 16 indicate that committee recommendations for Issue B were accorded a positive referral in four of the five universities. In the categories indicating that Issue B was positively referred, the collective distribution for "approved," "recommended," and "put into effect," represented committee member responses of 62%, 41%, 59%, 58%, and 53% in the five universities.

Committee respondents indicating that Issue B was "recommended" were 46% at Illinois, 53% at Michigan, 43% at Purdue, and 46% at Wisconsin. At Indiana 38% of the committee members did not answer the question.

Analysis of committee recommendations made

It appears that issues brought before committees, as indicated by the data gathered in this study, did receive some favorable referral in four out of five of the universities for both Issue A and Issue B. Favorable referral was previously described as "approved," "recommended," or "put into effect." These data signify that committees seem prone to approve the majority of issues or problems placed before them. This may be the result of careful work on the part of the administrative officers who serve mainly in an ex-officio capacity to these committees and who are subject to the decisions made.

To Whom Recommendations Were Made

Each faculty participant on a committee relating to a selected student personnel service was asked to indicate to whom the committee recommendations were made on the two most important issues or subjects. In Table 17, opposite the designation of where recommendations were made, appears the percentages of committee responses under the university and by Issue A (the first issue reported) and Issue B (the second issue reported).

Table 17 can be read in the following manner. At Illinois 65% of the committee respondents reported that Issue A recommendations were referred to the "administration," and 4% were referred to the "faculty." Concerning Issue B at Illinois, 51% of the committee respondents indicated that recommendations were made to the "administration," and 7% were referred to the "faculty."

To whom recommendations made--Issue A

In Table 17 one can observe that the "administration" was most often the recipient of recommendations made by committees. The "administration" was chosen by more committee respondents than any other single category as indicated by the distribution of 65%, 57%, 35%, 40%, and 45% of the replies at the five universities.

Second to the "administration" was the "autonomous" category as shown by the committee respondents who reported that recommendations were made to no one because of the nature of the problem or of the authority of the committee. Committee respondents indicating

TABLE 17

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY WHOM COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS WERE MADE FOR TWO MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES DISCUSSED

Recommendation made to	Issue A N = 253					Issue B N = 253				
	Ill. N=89	Ind. N=32	Mich. N=17	Pur. N=35	Wis. N=80	Ill. N=89	Ind. N=32	Mich. N=17	Pur. N=35	Wis. N=80
No response	8%	19%	18%	23%	14%	17%	28%	24%	40%	33%
Administration	65	47	35	40	45	51	38	35	29	33
Faculty	4	3	18	14	13	7		6	6	11
Regents					1		3		3	1
Students	4	9	12	17	6	7	19	12	14	4
Autonomous	13	19	12	6	20	16	13	12	9	13
Not completed	2				1	1		6		3
Other	2	3	6			2		6		4

an "autonomous" relationship for their committee constituted 20% at Wisconsin and 19% of the responses at Indiana. The "autonomous" category can be attributed to an organizational structure which leaves some administrative jurisdiction to those who are discussing a particular problem. Among committee members who did not respond, there were 23% at Purdue, 19% at Indiana, and 18% at Michigan who did not state to whom recommendations were made on Issue A as indicated in Table 17.

In other categories, Michigan committee respondents reported that 18% of the recommendations for Issue A were made to the "faculty" while at Purdue this was represented by 14% and at Wisconsin 13%. Purdue committee respondents reported that 17% of the recommendations of committees were made to "students," while Michigan committee respondents indicated that for Issue A this was 12%.

To whom recommendations made--Issue B

According to the data found in Table 17, Issue B committee recommendations were made more often to the "administration." Committee respondents indicated the category of "administration" in the respective universities by 51%, 38%, 35%, 29%, and 33% of the total. As expected, the percentages for those committee members who did not respond were higher for Issue B than for Issue A. This can be attributed to the fact that some committee respondents reported that only one issue was discussed. Among those universities which had a significant percentage of "no response" for Issue B were Purdue with 40% and Wisconsin with 33%.

The second category checked more often than any other was that which indicated that the Issue B recommendations of committees were made to "students." Of those committee respondents who indicated that committee recommendations were made to "students" were 19% at Indiana, 14% at Purdue, and 12% at Michigan.

Analysis of data

The findings of Table 17 reinforce the point made earlier in this chapter about the referral nature of committees. The information reported by members of committees confirms that disposition of issues and problems consists largely of recommendations to the "administration." The categories selected much less frequently by committee respondents were "faculty" and "students" as the recipients of committee recommendations.

Action Taken on Committee Recommendations

To ascertain the action which was taken on the committee recommendations for both Issue A and Issue B each committee participant was asked what action was taken on the recommendation for each issue or subject identified. The findings are shown in Table 18. Opposite each type of action taken, and under the university and issue, are given the percentages of committee responses. It can be observed that at Michigan 82% of the committee recommendations were reportedly "put into effect" for Issue A, while at Illinois 53% of the committee recommendations for Issue B were "put into effect." The remainder of the table can be read in a similar fashion. Issue A refers to the first issue or subject reportedly discussed by a committee, and Issue B refers to the second issue discussed.

Action taken on Issue A recommendations

The majority of committee respondents indicated in Table 18 that committee recommendations were "put into effect." Such action was indicated by committee respondents collectively by 64%, 56%, 82%, 57%, and 61% at the respective institutions.

Among the committee members who did not reply to the question relating to action taken on recommendations, were 23% at Wisconsin, 19% at Indiana, and 17% at Michigan. Four of the universities had committee responses in the "under study" category with 8% at Illinois, 3% at Indiana, 11% at Purdue, and 6% at Wisconsin. In the "deferred" category Illinois respondents on committees had 9%, Indiana 9%, Purdue 6%, and Wisconsin 3%. In the "pending" category the distribution was Illinois 6%, Indiana 9%, Purdue 3%, and Wisconsin 5% for action taken on Issue A recommendations.

The "deferred," "under study," and "pending" categories constitute similar action in that the issue was tabled for the present time. According to the data in Table 18, these three categories thus accounted for a combined percentage at four of the universities as follows: 23% at Illinois, 21% at Indiana, 20% at Purdue, and 14% at Wisconsin for Issue A as it related to action taken on committee recommendations. At Michigan there were no committee respondents indicating any of the above mentioned categories. Only 1% of the committee respondents at Illinois and 1% at Wisconsin indicated that action taken on committee recommendations for Issue A constituted "rejections." There were no committee members reporting any "rejections" at the other three universities.

TABLE 18

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY ACTION TAKEN ON COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TWO MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES DISCUSSED

Action categories	Issue A N = 253					Issue B N = 253				
	Ill. N=89	Ind. N=32	Mich. N=17	Pur. N=35	Wis. N=80	Ill. N=89	Ind. N=32	Mich. N=17	Pur. N=35	Wis. N=80
No response	8%	19%	18%	17%	23%	17%	31%	24%	34%	39%
Put into effect	64	56	82	57	61	53	47	41	37	40
Deferred	9	9		6	3	6	9	12	6	4
Rejected	1				1	2		6		1
Under study	8	3		11	6	9		12	11	9
Pending	6	9		3	5	8	9		6	4
No action necessary	2	3		3		2	3			3
Other	2			3	1	3		6	6	1

Action taken on Issue B recommendations

As can be seen in Table 18, for Issue B as for Issue A the action taken more frequently than any other according to committee respondents was that the recommendation was "put into effect." At Illinois 53% of the committee respondents indicated that this was the disposition for Issue B recommendations. A significant percentage at each of the other universities indicated that for Issue B the action taken on committee recommendation was that it was "put into effect" by 47% at Indiana, 41% at Michigan, 37% at Purdue, and 40% at Wisconsin. Percentages of those who did not respond for Issue B were 17%, 31%, 24%, 34%, and 39% at the respective universities.

Deferred action indicated by committee respondents were 6%, 9%, 12%, 6%, and 4% of the total. The "under study" category was indicated by 9% at Illinois, 12% at Michigan, 11% at Purdue, and 9% at Wisconsin. The "pending" category accounted for 8% of the committee respondents at Illinois, 9% at Indiana, 6% at Purdue, and 4% at Wisconsin. These combined categories accounted for committee responses of 22%, 18%, 24%, 23%, and 17% for Issue B in the five universities. Action taken on committee recommendations which were "rejected" were only 2% at Illinois, 6% at Michigan, and 1% at Wisconsin.

Analysis of action taken on committee recommendations

Observation of the data in Table 18 reveals that most recommendations of committees were "put into effect" as the disposition more than any other alternative available. Recommendations of committees were reportedly "put into effect" by the majority of committee respondents for Issue A and by a significant percentage in Issue B. One should note the small percentage of committee respondents who indicated that committee recommendations were "rejected." It appears that committees exert strong influence on those who execute policy.

Preferred Action on Recommendations

To find out what action was preferred by members of committees relative to the recommendation made, each committee respondent was asked his opinion as to the action which should have taken place in accordance with the committee recommendation for Issue A and Issue B. Table 19 may be read in the following manner. At Illinois 73% of the committee respondents indicated that the committee recommendation should have been "put into effect" in Issue A, and 64% felt this way for Issue B.

Preferred action on recommendation--Issue A

A majority of the committee respondents in each university expressed the opinion that committee recommendations should have been "put into effect." Committee members who indicated that the committee recommendation ought to have been "put into effect" represented percentages of 73%, 56%, 82%, 69%, and 70% at the respective universities.

TABLE 19

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY PREFERRED ACTION ON COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TWO MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES DISCUSSED

Preferred action	Issue A N = 253					Issue B N = 253				
	Ill. N=89	Ind. N=32	Mich. N=17	Pur. N=35	Wis. N=80	Ill. N=89	Ind. N=32	Mich. N=17	Pur. N=35	Wis. N=80
No response	12%	22%	18%	17%	25%	19%	34%	24%	37%	41%
Put into effect	73	56	82	69	70	64	53	53	49	46
Deferred	6	9				2	3	6	3	4
Rejected						1				
Clarification	2	3				3			3	
Further discussion	3	6		14	4	4	6	12	9	6
Cannot say						1	3			
Other	3	3			1	4		6		3

However, at Purdue 14% of the committee respondents felt that "further discussion" was in order. The "deferred" category was reported by 6% at Illinois and by 9% of the committee respondents at Indiana as the action which should have been taken on committee recommendations. Those committee respondents from whom "no response" was received constituted percentages of 12%, 22%, 18%, 17%, and 25% collectively in the five universities.

Preferred action on recommendations--Issue B

According to the data found in Table 19, a significant percentage of committee respondents indicated that committee recommendations for Issue B should have been "put into effect." The "put into effect" category was reported by committee respondents in the following percentages at the respective universities: 64%, 53%, 53%, 49%, and 46%. It can be noted that 12% of the committee respondents at Michigan felt that Issue B recommendations should have had "further discussion," and a similar expression was received by 9% of committee members responding from Purdue. The "no response" category for preferred action taken on committee recommendations represented 19%, 34%, 24%, 37%, and 41% at the respective universities.

Analysis of preferred action on recommendations

One can observe in Table 19 that a majority of committee respondents indicated that Issue A committee recommendations should have been "put into effect" as the appropriate action to be taken.

In Issue B, a significant percentage of committee respondents reported that the recommendation of the committee should have been "put into effect."

As previously mentioned in this chapter, Table 18 data indicate that committee recommendations had been "put into effect" in the majority of cases for Issue A and by a significant percentage for Issue B. "Rejection" of committee recommendations was indicated by a very few committee respondents. It therefore follows that committees which recommend the two most important issues, and then observe that they are "put into effect," would agree with the action taken. That is why there is a high percentage of committee respondents who indicated the "put into effect" category in Table 18 and Table 19 for both Issue A and Issue B.

Where a dissenting opinion was recorded for action taken on a committee recommendation, it was usually because a committee respondent felt that there was need for "further discussion." A similar action which was preferred, although less than the percentage recorded for "further discussion," was found in the need to "defer" the issue. Perhaps some of the committee members felt that before a course of action was recommended there needed to be more time to work on the matter, to find out more about it, or even to ignore the problem in the hope that a solution would evolve. In the majority of instances, however, committee respondents seemed to indicate that their recommendations were "put into effect" and agreed that this is exactly the disposition that was required.

Nature of Issues

Each committee respondent was asked whether the two most important issues or subjects that were reportedly discussed by committees were in the nature of "policy-making" or "program execution." In Table 20, opposite the nature of the issue and under the university, are the percentages of committee responses by Issue A and Issue B. Observation of Table 20 reveals that 65% of Illinois committee respondents reported that Issue A was concerned with "policy-making" and 56% of the committee respondents at Illinois reported that Issue B was concerned with "policy-making."

Nature of Issue A

One can observe in Table 20 that the majority of committee respondents in four out of five of the universities indicated that Issue A was concerned with "policy-making." At Purdue, 49% of the committee respondents reported that Issue A was concerned with "policy-making." "Program execution" was indicated as the nature of Issue A by 29% of the committee respondents at Purdue, 28% at Indiana, 27% at Illinois, 25% at Wisconsin, and 24% at Michigan. The committee respondents who made no response as to the nature of Issue A constituted percentages of as much as 23% at Purdue and as little as 8% at Illinois.

Nature of Issue B

According to the data in Table 20, a majority of committee respondents at two universities indicated that the nature of

Issue B was "policy-making." At Michigan 65% of the committee respondents and at Illinois 65% of the committee respondents reported that Issue B was in the nature of "policy-making." The highest percentage of committee respondents indicating that Issue B was in the nature of "program execution" was found at Wisconsin, where 31% was recorded in this category.

TABLE 20

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY NATURE OF ISSUES DISCUSSED BY COMMITTEES FOR TWO MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES

Nature of Issue	Issue A N = 253					Issue B N = 253				
	Ill.	Ind.	Mich.	Pur.	Wis.	Ill.	Ind.	Mich.	Pur.	Wis.
No response	8%	16%	18%	23%	21%	16%	31%	24%	37%	35%
Policy-making	65	56	59	49	54	56	44	65	37	34
Program execution	27	28	24	29	25	28	25	12	26	31
Total Sample (N)	89	32	17	35	80	89	32	17	35	80

Analysis of nature of issues discussed

Issues or subjects discussed by committees relating to selected student personnel services of this study appear to be mostly in the nature of "policy-making." It should be noted in Table 20 however, that one out of every four issues reported by committee respondents is considered to be in the nature of "program execution." The remaining 75% is divided between "policy-making" and "no response," with the percentage of committee responses indicating "policy-making" as the nature of both Issue A and Issue B by a significant margin.

Significance of Issues

To determine the significance of issues or subjects discussed by committees with which this investigation was concerned, all committee members were asked to indicate the significance of Issue A and Issue B in helping to fulfill the aims and objectives of the student personnel service with which the committee was associated. In Table 21, opposite the rating of significance and under the university by Issue A and Issue B, are recorded the percentages of committee responses. It can be seen in Table 21 that 84% of the committee respondents at Illinois reported that Issue A was "significant." At Illinois 79% of the committee respondents indicated that Issue B was "significant."

TABLE 21

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY SIGNIFICANCE OF ISSUES DISCUSSED BY COMMITTEES FOR TWO MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES

Sig. of Issues	Issue A N = 253					Issue B N = 253				
	Ill.	Ind.	Mich.	Pur.	Wis.	Ill.	Ind.	Mich.	Pur.	Wis.
No response	11%	16%	18%	20%	23%	16%	34%	24%	37%	36%
Significant	84	81	82	77	70	79	59	76	54	55
Insignificant	4	3		3	8	6	6		9	9
Total Sample (N)	89	32	17	35	80	89	32	17	35	80

Significance of Issue A

Table 21 shows that a very high percentage of committee respondents indicated that Issue A was "significant" in helping to fulfill the aims and objectives of the student personnel service with which the committee was concerned. Percentages of committee respondents who indicated that Issue A was "significant" were 84%, 81%, 82%, 77%, and 70% of the replies in the respective universities. There was "no response" among committee respondents for Issue A significance by 23% at Wisconsin and by 20% at Purdue.

Significance of Issue B

Observation of Table 21 shows that a majority of the committee respondents reported that Issue B was "significant." This was the answer given by 79%, 59%, 76%, 54%, and 55% of the respondents at the respective institutions. There was a higher percentage of respondents who made "no response" about the significance of Issue B than about the significance of Issue A. This is consistent with the fact that some respondents failed to identify more than one issue.

Analysis of the significance of issues discussed

In those instances when committee respondents reported an issue it was rated as "significant" in a high percentage of cases. This was especially true in the responses recorded for Issue A as can be seen in Table 21. The majority of responses for Issue B indicated that issues discussed were also significant where there was a second important issue or subject to consider.

Whether committee members were discussing "policy-making" or "program execution" it would appear that in most instances they feel that they are deliberating "significant" matters and that their participation is justified.

Reasons for Reported Significance of Issues

To ascertain why respondents rated the major issues or subjects discussed by the committees on which they served as to their significance, each committee respondent was asked why he considered each of the important issues or subjects discussed as "significant" or "insignificant." No attempt was made to structure the reasons reported for significance, but rather each respondent was given the opportunity to express in his own words the reasons for his rating of the significance of Issue A and Issue B. The reasons given were then coded into several categories.

In Table 22, opposite a given reason, are listed the percentages of response by committee members under the university and by Issue A and Issue B. It can be observed that 43% of the committee respondents at Illinois reported that the Issue A significance rating was given because it was "important," and 38% at Illinois reported "important" as the reason for the significance rating for Issue B.

Reasons for significance--Issue A

The reason indicated more often than any other in Table 22 for the significance rating given by committee respondents for Issue A was that the matter was "important." The "important" category was indicated in a distribution of 43%, 28%, 24%, 29%, and 28% of the committee respondents at the respective universities. Those

TABLE 22

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY REASONS FOR REPORTED SIGNIFICANCE FOR TWO MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES DISCUSSED BY COMMITTEES

Significance categories	Issue A N = 253					Issue B N = 253				
	Ill. N=89	Ind. N=32	Mich. N=17	Pur. N=35	Wis. N=80	Ill. N=89	Ind. N=32	Mich. N=17	Pur. N=35	Wis. N=80
No response	15%	31%	24%	29%	29%	20%	44%	24%	43%	45%
Specific purpose cited	10	25			15	11	16	6		14
Total effect		3					6			
Rewards students			6				3			
Important	43	28	24	29	28	38	13	18	11	20
Effective	10		18	6	1	15	6	18		1
Not important		3			4		3			1
Ineffective	6		6	3	5	6		12	6	9
Related to scholastic life	16	9	24	34	19	7	6	24	40	10
Other	1					3	3			

who gave "no response" to Issue A as the reason for significance constituted 15%, 31%, 24%, 29%, and 29% of the total.

Another reason given consistently in each university as a justification for the significance rating by committee respondents for Issue A was that the matter was "related to scholastic life." Those committee members who gave the reason "related to scholastic life" were 16%, 9%, 24%, 34%, and 19% respectively in the five universities.

At three universities there was a "specific purpose cited" by committee respondents as the reason for the significance rating given to Issue A. There was a "specific purpose cited" as the reason for the reported significance of Issue A by 25% of the committee respondents at Indiana, 15% at Wisconsin, and 10% at Illinois.

Reasons for significance--Issue B

It can be observed in Table 22 that one reason cited consistently by committee respondents for significance rating for Issue B was that the matter was "important." The "important" category accounted for committee responses as the reason for the significance rating by 38%, 13%, 18%, 11%, and 20% of the total responses for Issue B. "No response" was recorded for one-fifth of the respondents at Illinois and nearly one-half of the committee members reporting for Wisconsin as it related to the reasons reported for significance ratings of Issue B.

Committee respondents who reported "related to scholastic life" as the reason for their significance ratings for Issue B included 40% at Purdue, 24% at Michigan, 10% at Wisconsin, 7% at Illinois, and 6% at Indiana. Other reasons given for significance of Issue B included 18% at Michigan who indicated "effective," and there was a "specific purpose cited" by 16% at Indiana and 14% at Wisconsin. At Michigan 12% of the committee respondents indicated that the reason for their significance ratings was that Issue B was "ineffective."

Analysis of reasons for reported significance of issues

The opportunity to complete an answer which best described the reason for rating the significance of Issue A and Issue B resulted in positive responses in the majority of instances. The positive reasons for the rated significance of issues reported in Table 22 is consistent with the high percentage of significance which was indicated in Table 21 and discussed in the previous section of this chapter.

CHAPTER VI

THE RELATIONSHIP OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS TO FACULTY PARTICIPATION

The study thus far has consisted of an exploration of the extent and nature of faculty participation in selected student personnel services at five large public universities. This chapter will show the results of the application of the Rackham Student Personnel Services Inventory of program effectiveness and its relationship to some aspects of faculty participation. In Chapter VII the study will be summarized, conclusions drawn, and appropriate recommendations will be made for future investigation.

Measurement of Program Effectiveness

Rackham student personnel service effectiveness scores

The Rackham Student Personnel Services Inventory was applied at each of the universities in those areas selected for the study. *The Rackham Profile Sheet for each of these universities will be found in Appendix D of the investigation.* These scores indicate the level of program effectiveness achieved in the eight student personnel services at each of the five universities in comparison with an ideal program.

The results of the application of the Rackham Student Personnel Services Inventory are tabulated in Table 23, along with the over-all rank order of program effectiveness at each university, and some of the aspects of faculty participation which were discussed earlier in the study. The mean and the standard deviation are also shown.

The scores indicate that the highest measures of program effectiveness were found in "discipline" at Purdue, in "financial aids" at Michigan, in "housing and board" at Indiana and Wisconsin, in "organization and administration" at Indiana, in "orientation" at Indiana and Michigan, and in "placement" at Michigan.

The lowest scores of student personnel services were in "extra-curricular activities" at Purdue and Michigan, and in "orientation" at Purdue. The scores listed above the double lines in Table 23 relate to the effectiveness of student personnel services. Those figures listed below the double line are various aspects of faculty participation for comparison with program effectiveness.

Over-all program effectiveness score

All of the Rackham Profile Scores were compared by student personnel service within each university. These were placed in rank order and a sum of the ranks was obtained at each university. From this measure was taken the "over-all rank order" of institutional program effectiveness in the selected student personnel services. The scores indicated that the universities were ranked as follows: Indiana 1, Michigan 2, Purdue 3, Illinois and Wisconsin tied for fourth place and so received rankings of 4.5 each. For purposes of comparison these rank order scores were inverted as explained in the next paragraph.

TABLE 23

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SELECTED AREAS OF STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES, ALSO SELECTED MEASURES OF FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN COMMITTEE WORK AND IN INDIVIDUAL (NON-COMMITTEE) PARTICIPATION

FACTOR TO BE COMPARED	Ill.	Ind.	Mich.	Pur.	Wisc.	$\overline{X}$	SD.
Discipline effectiveness	161	154	169	185	161	166	10.6
Extra-curricular activities*	149	159	129	119	159	143	16.2
Financial aids*	362	362	417	307	399	369	37.8
Housing and board*	808	847	729	808	847	807	43.0
Organization and administration*	611	642	456	611	518	567	69.5
Orientation*	149	220	220	139	189	183	34.2
Placement*	580	518	673	642	580	598	54.0
Overall Rank Order*	1.5	5	4	3	1.5	3.00	1.37
Committee Participation by Area	5.2	4.4	5.9	4.6	3.5	4.71	.8
Individual Participation by Area**	4.2	3.6	4.7	4.5	3.1	4.01	.6
Average Academic Rank, Committee Work	1.5	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.64	.1
Average Academic Rank, Individual Participation**	2.2	2.5	1.7	2.2	2.2	2.16	.2
Average Age, Committee Work	50.7	48.4	43.4	48.5	50.4	48.2	2.61
Average Age, Individual Participation**	37.0	43.6	44.4	41.8	42.0	41.7	2.57
Average Hours Spent Per Month on Committee Work	7.8	7.3	6.2	4.3	4.6	6.0	1.4
Average Hours Spent Per Month in Committee Meetings	7.2	2.3	5.0	2.4	2.7	3.9	1.9
Average Hours Spent Per Month on Individual Participation**	8.0	5.7	8.3	8.9	6.2	7.4	1.2
Monthly Frequency of Individual Participation**	6.1	4.2	7.6	7.6	4.5	5.9	1.4
Number of Committee Responses	89	32	17	35	80	50.6	28.4
Number of Committee Participants	80	27	15	35	66	44.6	24.4
Number of Individual Participation Responses**	196	153	129	216	143	167	33.0
Number of Individuals Participating**	190	135	123	186	137	154	28.0

*Effectiveness rating
**Non-committee activity

By inverting the "over-all rank order" of program effectiveness for each university a more comparable measurement was obtained. The higher number in the converted score indicates greater value. This is comparable with the measures of certain aspects of faculty participation which were used for statistical correlations. The converted effectiveness rating of the student personnel services program at each of the five universities was thus: Indiana 5, Michigan 4, Purdue 3, and Illinois and Wisconsin have a score of 1.5 each. The converted score gives 5 the best score and 1.5 the lowest "over-all" effectiveness score for a student personnel services program at a given university.

The relationship between student personnel services

Pearson correlation values were computed between the effectiveness scores of the selected student personnel services and are shown in Table 24. Comparisons were made to see if a significant relationship could be found between one student personnel service and another. It was thought that perhaps, since there seemed to be more faculty participation in some areas of student personnel work than in others, it might also be found that certain of the services exhibited a correlation to others. Although these relationships are interesting, they are merely informational for the reader who might wonder about the significance of one service to another. The important problem for the purposes of this investigation is to study the relationship of faculty participation to program effectiveness. It will suffice here to merely point out where there seems to be a significant relationship between student personnel services. In order to do this a word or two concerning the statistical method followed seems appropriate.

Computing the Pearson r

The correlation coefficient for any paired data to be statistically significant must have a value which is at least .878 at the five per cent level of confidence in a sample of five.[1] However, there are indications that correlations in other paired choices may also suggest possible relationships if the results obtained were to be interpreted as indicative of significant values of a larger sample.

Correlation of student personnel services

Analysis of the relationship of one student personnel service to another was completed after computing Pearson correlation values. This enables one to determine whether relationships between student personnel services seem to be suggested from the data presented. Pearson correlation values for relationships between services are listed in Table 24. In descending order of significance, the following Pearson r's tend to be in the direction of significant correlations at the five per cent level of confidence.

1. Positive correlations:
    a) Placement and discipline +.77
    b) Housing and board and extra-curricular activities +.67
    c) Organization and administration and housing and board +.65
    d) Orientation and the over-all rank order +.65

---

[1] Abridged from Table VI, R. A. Fischer and F. Yates, Statistical Tables, Oliver and Boyd, Ltd., Edinburg, 1953.

TABLE 24

CORRELATIONS OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS OF CERTAIN AREAS OF STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES

	Rackham Inventory Effectiveness Rating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	Discipline	1.00							
2	Extra-curricular activities	-.93*	1.00						
3	Financial aids	-.53	.37	1.00					
4	Housing and board	-.39	.67	-.36	1.00				
5	Organization and administration	-.10	.21	-.79	.65	1.00			
6	Orientation	-.57	.37	.72	-.17	-.42	1.00		
7	Placement	.77	-.86	.10	-.84	-.65	-.17	1.00	
8	Overall Rank Order	-.08	-.13	-.00	-.20	.10	.65	-.08	1.00

*Statistically significant at five per cent level of confidence

2. Negative correlations:

   a) Extra-curricular activities and discipline -.93
   b) Placement and extra-curricular activities -.86
   c) Placement and housing and board -.84
   d) Placement and organization and administration -.65

The results of running correlations between the effectiveness scores of student personnel services would tend to suggest that a positive relationship exists between the level of effectiveness of "placement" and that of "discipline."

The negative correlations indicate that "extra-curricular activities" and "discipline" have the highest amount of adverse affect on each other. The Pearson correlation value obtained was -.93. This indicates that for these five universities the higher the effectiveness score of "extra-curricular activities" the lower will be the effectiveness score of "discipline." While the other negative correlations are not as high, they seem to be in the direction of significant relationships.

The Relationship of Program Effectiveness and Faculty Participation

In order to test the hypotheses the scores of program effectiveness for each of five universities were obtained from application of the Rackham Student Personnel Services Inventory. Program effectiveness scores were compared with certain levels of faculty participation to determine whether a significant relationship could be found. Pearson correlation values were secured by use of a computer on all of these aspects to determine whether a significant relationship could be found between the selected student personnel services and faculty participation.

Measurement of faculty participation

Analysis of various aspects of both committee and individual participation revealed that statistical comparisons could be made best between program effectiveness and the extent of faculty participation. Levels of faculty participation were thus obtained for comparison with the levels of program effectiveness. Aspects of faculty participation selected for the purpose of determining relationships with program effectiveness included: (1) the academic rank of faculty participants, (2) the age of faculty participants, and (3) the number of faculty participants. The factors listed above were investigated for both committee and individual participation of faculty members in the selected student personnel services of the five universities.

Restatement of the hypotheses

The above aspects form the framework with which the several hypotheses were concerned. As stated in Chapter I the higher the amount of faculty participation, the more effective will be a university's program of student personnel services.

Testing the relationship of program effectiveness and faculty participation

To test the validity of each of the several hypotheses it was necessary to first obtain correlations on all of those aspects relating to committee and individual participation by faculty members or to the effectiveness of the program of student personnel services which seemed to indicate the possibility of a relationship. Measures of faculty participation are discussed in Chapter III. The levels of program effectiveness as it pertains to the selected student personnel services have been discussed earlier in this chapter.

Table 25 indicates the Pearson correlation values which were obtained by testing the relationship between the effectiveness of programs of student personnel services and certain aspects of faculty participation. It would appear that several of the Pearson correlation values suggest that significant relationships do exist. We shall first examine all of those results which indicate a correlation coefficient, then we shall analyze those which specifically relate to the hypotheses of the investigation.

Correlations indicated

The following product-moment correlations tend to indicate a significant relationship. The Pearson correlation values given for these paired factors are given at the five per cent level of confidence:[2]

1. Positive Pearson correlation values seem to be indicated for the following:
   - a) Number of committee members and number of committee responses +.99
   - b) Monthly frequency of individual participation and average hours spent per month on individual participation +.97
   - c) Number of individual participants and number of individual responses +.96
   - d) Monthly frequency of individual participation and individual participation by area +.93
   - e) Average academic rank of committee members and over-all program effectiveness +.92
   - f) Average hours spent per month on individual participation by area +.89
   - g) Individual participation by area and committee participation by area +.88

---

[2] Ibid.

TABLE 25

CORRELATIONS OF SELECTED MEASURES OF FACULTY PARTICIPATION WITH PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS IN CERTAIN STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES

		8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
8	Overall Rank Order of effectiveness	1.00														
9	Committee Participation by Area	.30	1.00													
10	Individual (non-committee) Participation by Area	.23	.88*	1.00												
11	Average Academic Rank, Committee Work	.92*	.01	-.11	1.00											
12	Average Academic Rank, Individual (non-committee) Participation	.06	-.66	-.61	.14	1.00										
13	Average Age, Committee Work	-.63	-.69	-.62	-.53	.73	1.00									
14	Average Age, Individual (non-committee) Participation	.74	-.01	-.00	.84	-.23	-.70	1.00								
15	Average Hours Spent Per Month on Committee Work	.23	.46	.09	.13	.17	.01	-.34	1.00							
16	Average Hours Spent Per Month in Committee Meetings	-.40	.65	.42	-.56	-.42	-.02	-.65	.62	1.00						
17	Average Hours Spent Per Month on Individual (non-com) Participation	-.19	.64	.89*	-.49	-.60	-.33	-.24	-.21	.41	1.00					
18	Monthly Frequency of Participation Individual (non-com) Participation	.01	.71	.93*	-.28	-.71	-.56	.01	-.24	.31	.97*	1.00				
19	Number of Committee Responses	-.88*	-.43	-.51	-.75	.31	.84	-.82	.12	.39	-.19	-.41	1.00			
20	Number of Committee Participants	-.89*	-.38	-.42	-.80	.30	.85	-.87*	.12	.43	-.10	-.33	.99*	1.00		
21	Number of Individual Participation Responses (non-committee activity)	-.32	-.02	.32	-.57	.35	.49	-.63	-.10	.10	.53	.34	.25	.35	1.00	
22	Number of Individuals Participating (non-committee activity)	-.50	.03	.29	-.74	.27	.56	-.81	.02	.33	.54	.32	.45	.54	.96*	1.00

*Statistically significant at five per cent level of confidence

h) Number of committee members and average age of committee members +.85
i) Average age of individual participants and average academic rank of committee members +.84
j) Number of committee responses and average age of committee members +.84
k) Average age of individual participants and over-all program effectiveness +.74
l) Average age of committee members and average academic rank of individual participants +.73

2. Negative Pearson correlation values seem to be indicated for the following:

a) Number of committee members and over-all program effectiveness -.89
b) Number of committee responses and over-all program effectiveness -.88
c) Number of committee members and average age of individual participants -.87
d) Number of committee responses and average age of individual participants -.82
e) Number of individual participants and average age of individual participants -.81
f) Number of committee members and average academic rank of committee members -.80
g) Number of committee responses and average academic rank of committee members -.75
h) Number of committee responses and average academic rank of committee members -.75
i) Average age of individual participants and average age of committee members -.70
j) Average age of committee members and committee participation by area -.69
k) Average academic rank of individual participants and committee participation by area -.66
l) Average hours spent per month in committee meetings and average age of individual participants -.65
m) Average age of committee participants and over-all program effectiveness -.63

Findings in relation to the hypotheses

The hypotheses of the investigation and the findings of their validity at the five per cent level of confidence are indicated as follows:

1. Hypothesis. The larger the number of faculty participants serving in committee work at universities the more effective

will be the program of student personnel services.

Finding. Correlation of the data indicated a negative Pearson r value of -.89. The null hypothesis is rejected.

2. Hypothesis. The larger the number of individual participants at universities the more effective will be the program of student personnel services.

   Finding. Correlation of the data indicate a negative Pearson r value of -.50. The null hypothesis is accepted.

3. Hypothesis. The higher the academic rank of committee members at universities the more effective will be the program of student personnel services.

   Finding. Correlation of the data indicated a positive Pearson r value of +.92. The null hypothesis is rejected.

4. Hypothesis. The higher the academic rank of individual participants at universities the more effective will be the program of student personnel services.

   Finding. Correlation of the data indicated a positive Pearson r value of +.06. The null hypothesis is accepted.

5. Hypothesis. The older the age of committee members at universities the more effective will be the program of student personnel services.

   Finding. Correlation of the data indicated a negative Pearson r value of -.63. The null hypothesis is accepted.

6. Hypothesis. The older the age of individual participants at universities the more effective will be the program of student personnel services.

   Finding. Correlation of the data indicated a positive Pearson r value of +.74. The null hypothesis is accepted.

Analysis of the findings

Hypothesis 1.--A negative relationship between the number of faculty members who serve in committee work at universities exists as this type of faculty participation correlates with over-all program effectiveness with an r of -.89. Rather than lack of correlation, the negative aspect would tend to indicate that the greater the number of committee members the more ineffective the student personnel services would tend to become.

Hypothesis 2.--There was no relationship established between the number of individual participants at universities and the over-all effectiveness of their programs of student personnel services. The r was -.50 and since this is below the limits of prudence for statistical analysis of correlation, it must be assumed for the purposes of this investigation that there is neither a positive nor a negative relationship.

Hypothesis 3.--There is a definite positive correlation coefficient between the academic rank of committee members and the over-all program effectiveness of student personnel services. This would tend to substantiate the findings in Chapter III which indicate a high incidence of faculty participation among senior members of the academic ranks. The r for this correlation was +.92.

Hypothesis 4.--There was no significant relationship between the academic rank of individual participants and the over-all program effectiveness of the student personnel services. The r was +.06. Since this is almost a zero correlation the academic rank of an individual participant appears to have little to do with the over-all program of effectiveness demonstrated by the selected student personnel services.

Hypothesis 5.--The age of committee members tends be related negatively to the over-all effectiveness of the student personnel services program. The r is -.63. Whereas the higher academic rank of committee members is positively correlated with effectiveness in the student personnel services program, the opposite is suggested when one compares the age of faculty members who serve on committees with program effectiveness. It would appear that the older a faculty member, the more ineffective the over-all student personnel services tend to be.

Hypothesis 6.--The age of individual participants tends to correlate positively with the over-all effectiveness rating of the student personnel services program. The r is +.74. Thus, the older the individual participant, the more effective the program tends to be. The relationship of age to program effectiveness is directly opposite to the level of the academic rank of the individual faculty participant. The academic rank was found to have little relationship with program effectiveness, whereas age of individual participants was found to correlate positively.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This investigation was conducted to determine the extent and nature of faculty participation in eight selected student personnel services at five large public universities in the mid-west. Moreover, the effectiveness level of the program of student personnel services at the respective institutions of higher learning was compared to certain aspects of faculty participation to ascertain whether a relationship could be found to exist.

The following universities cooperated in the study: University of Illinois, Indiana University, University of Michigan, Purdue University, and University of Wisconsin. The selected student personnel services were: counseling, discipline, extra-curricular activities, financial aid, housing and board, organization and administration, orientation and placement.

Importance of the study

A basic assumption of this investigation was that as universities become larger and more impersonal there is a trend toward more comprehensive systems of student personnel services and delegation of authority to competent specialists. However in the face of rising enrollments, and especially on the campus of the large public university, there is a tendency for abdication by the faculty member of his traditional role of responsibility for the student and participation in the governance of the university. Instead of a horizontal pattern of organization the university is adopting a centrally controlled administrative structure which emphasizes decisions at higher levels than ever before. The subsequent need to "sell" decisions to faculty members makes the disenchantment of both students and faculty members greater than ever.

Several sources of authority have expressed concern for the apparent deterioration of the historic corporate authority of the academic faculty. To these observers there is an obvious need to involve faculty members more actively in the decision-making processes of university administration.

In the case of the student personnel program it is essential to have faculty participation. It is the academic staff members who are in intimate daily contact with students, who have the tradition of concern for the individual student, and who have points of view which can contribute to program effectiveness. Without the participation of members of the academic community the successful achievement of student personnel services becomes an obstacle too overwhelming for any administrator.

Procedure

This investigation sought to study the involvement of faculty members as both participants in committee work and who were individually involved in selected student personnel services. The inquiry led to the construction of a three-part questionnaire to gather biographical information about the faculty participant, data concerning his membership in the committee structure of a university which related to one or more of the student personnel services, and/or the extent and nature of his individual participation. The letter to faculty members which requested information about his participation appears in the study as Appendix B. The questionnaire which was enclosed with this letter can be found in Appendix C.

By means of campus visits with the student personnel officers of the respective universities a total of 1,268 faculty members were identified as participants in both committee work and/or individual involvement. Questionnaires were then sent to each of these faculty members and 1,123 check-lists were completed and returned for a response of 88%. Of these completed forms were 159 which were found to be unsuitable and were discarded leaving a total usable response from 964 faculty members. This represented 75% of those originally identified as faculty participants. From this total sample results of the study were obtained. Data were analyzed on the basis of 253 usable committee participation forms and 837 individual participation forms.

To determine the level of effectiveness of the selected student personnel services the Revised Rackham Student Personnel Services Inventory was administered to the administrative officials in charge of these areas. This gives a weighted rating of student personnel services in comparison with an ideal program. The Revised Rackham Student Personnel Services Profile Scores are included in the study in Appendix A.

The results of the investigation were reported in previous chapters. Results consist of an examination of (1) the extent of faculty participation in Chapter III, (2) the nature of faculty participation in Chapter IV, (3) the important issues discussed by committees in Chapter V, and (4) the relationship of faculty participation to the effectiveness of a program of student personnel services in Chapter VI.

Summary of findings relative to the extent of faculty participation

Number of faculty participants by area of student personnel service.--The largest number of committee participants was found at Illinois with 89 faculty members responding. The least number was at Michigan with only 17 committee members participating in the study. In the distribution of faculty members by area as shown in Table 3, the majority were concerned with organization and administration more than any other. There was no committee participation in counseling and only two of the five universities reported committee participation in discipline and placement. It would appear that some of the services lend themselves more readily to committee participation than others, but this varies from one university to another. For instance, at Wisconsin 86% of the committee participation reported was in extra-curricular activities while at Illinois this represented only 4%.

In individual participation Purdue had the highest number with 216 faculty members completing usable questionnaries. The lowest number of individual responses was recorded at Michigan with 129. In the distribution between student personnel services the extra-curricular responses contained the largest amount of involvement at all of the universities varying from 52% at Purdue to 99% at Wisconsin. No personal involvement was found in either discipline or student financial aids, and only two of the five universities had individual participation in counseling, housing and board, and placement.

In both committee and individual participation there were differences indicated among student personnel services and from one university to another. The student personnel officer needs to know where faculty participation seems to be utilized effectively, and where an administrative staff member may proceed without assistance from the academic community. There may be jurisdictions within the program in which the professional student personnel officer has need to administer without recourse to the instructional staff.

Faculty participation by academic rank.--The distribution of responses by academic rank is shown in Table 4. A very large proportion of committee members seems to be chosen from the top two academic ranks. The highest percentage was indicated at Purdue with 91% from the senior academic ranks while the lowest percentage in this regard was at Indiana with 81%. There were two universities that had members of committees from below the rank of assistant professor. Illinois had only 4% in this category, however, and Indiana 3%. The procedure for selecting committee members is apparently limited to those who have proven themselves academically in the respective universities.

The individual participants seem to consist of a greater percentage of assistant professors than associate professors--opposite to the participation indicated by committee membership. Senior faculty members thus represent a near monopoly of committees and are in the majority in the individual participation. When a committee vacancy occurs for a faculty member, the odds are four to one that someone will be selected from the upper two academic ranks, and it is rare indeed to fill the appointment from below the rank of assistant professor. A better chance exists for individual participation from the academic ranks of assistant professor and below.

Faculty participation by age.--The age distribution data in Table 5 reinforces the point made earlier in the study that senior faculty members predominate as members of committees. At each university the combined responses of the respondents in the age categories of 41-50 and over 50 years of age were in the majority. Responses from the two senior age categories varied from as much as 82% at Purdue to as little as 65% at Michigan. In three of the universities there was no committee member reported under the age of 30 and only 4% and 6% were found in this category at the other two universities. In three of the five universities there were more individual participants from the age categories of 41-50 and over 50 than from the two younger age classifications. However, in two universities the distribution of individual participants was about equally divided between the upper and lower two age categories.

Amount of monthly participation.--Data found in Table 6 indicate that the largest percentage of committee participants spent nine hours or less per month in both committee meetings and other committee work. There is a difference indicated between the amount of time spent on committee work in general (mean 6.0 hours) and in the time spent at meetings in particular (mean 3.9) hours in all of the universities. Approximately 40% of the time spent on committee activity is taken up with work in preparation for, or as a result of, committee meetings.

For individual participation, the data indicate that even more hours per month are spent by faculty members than for committee participation. Individual participants spent an average of 7.4 hours per month while committee members spent an average of 6.0 hours per month. Individually, faculty members seem to participate on an average of nearly six times per month thus spreading their participation to an average of a little less than an hour on a given occasion. The participation of faculty members represents time away from the classroom which should be supplemental to the academic program and rewarding to both the instructional staff member and to the student.

Summary of findings relative to the nature of faculty participation

Effectiveness of committee.--Table 8 contains the distribution of responses which concern the effectiveness of committees and that of the individual participant. Committee effectiveness was highly rated by a large percentage of committee members. The two categories in which committee effectiveness was rated highly (either greatly or moderately) effective constituted percentages of 88%, 91%, 94%, 74%, and 88% of the responses. There were more committee members in each university, however, who indicated that their committee was considered by them to be moderately rather than greatly effective.

Individual participants were found to rate their personal effectiveness as greatly or moderately effective by 74%, 72%, 77%, 86%, and 82% respectively in the universities. As in committee participation, a higher percentage of individual respondents felt that their effectiveness personally was moderate rather than greatly effective. Individual participation effectiveness at Purdue alone was rated higher than was committee effectiveness.

Reason for effectiveness of committee.--The tabulation of reasons given for committee effectiveness in Table 9 has a majority of positive responses. Positive responses were those which referred to important topics which were discussed, that most recommendations were implemented, or that a combination of these reasons applied. Positive reasons which were reported by a majority of respondents correspond generally to the satisfaction with committee effectiveness which was reported by committee members. Positive reasons were reported by respondents for committee effectiveness ratings by 81%, 82%, 89%, 63%, and 78% in the respective universities. The majority of positive reasons reported for committee effectiveness suggests either that important topics were discussed or that most recommendations were implemented. Negative answers represented a small part of the replies for given reasons to explain committee effectiveness.

Reason for effectiveness of individual participant.--The distribution of reasons given most often for the individual effectiveness of faculty participants is shown in Table 10. The reason which was indicated most often was that the participant had ideas, knowledge, or experience to contribute which helped to fulfill the aims and objectives of the student personnel service in which he had been a participant. Such a reason was given by 23%, 22%, 22%, 18% and 27% of the individual respondents in the respective universities. When comparing the two factors, it would appear that a higher percentage of positive reasons were given by faculty members for their committee effectiveness than were given by faculty members for their personal effectiveness in individual non-committee activity.

Sources of appreciation for faculty participation.--The data in Table 11 indicate that a minority of faculty members indicated that their colleagues and their superior were a source of appreciation for their committee participation. This was the case at all of the universities. Only a majority of the committee respondents at one university reported students as a source of appreciation. However, at three of the universities a majority of committee members reported that the administration was a source of appreciation for their participation. At each of the universities, a high percentage of committee respondents reported that self-satisfaction was a source of appreciation for continued participation.

A higher percentage of individual respondents indicated that their colleagues and superior were sources of appreciation than did their committee counterparts. A slightly higher proportion of individual participants than committee members indicated that the superior was not a source of appreciation. It would appear that the superior is more likely to indicate both approval and disapproval for individual participation than was evidenced for committee participation. Students were cited by individual participants as a source of appreciation by higher percentages than any other category. Individual participants who indicated that students were a source of appreciation for their continued participation were collectively 84%, 80%, 90%, 88%, and 91% in the respective universities.

Individual participants at four institutions cited the administration as a source for appreciation by lower percentages than were reported for committee respondents. Only at Purdue was there indication of a higher incidence of individual response than was the case with committee membership as it related to the administration as a source for appreciation for continued participation. There was a higher proportion of individual participants indicating that the administration was not a source of appreciation for continued participation than was reported by committee respondents.

The data in Table 11 reveal that in four of the five universities there was an even higher percentage of individual participants who indicated that self-satisfaction was a source of appreciation for participation than was reported by committee respondents. Individual participants who identified self-satisfaction as a source for their continued participation were 77%, 69%, 68%, 83%, and 73% in the respective universities. Analysis of the data revealed in Table 11 would lead one to the conclusion that faculty participants perceive the amount of appreciation for participation differently for committee and individual participation.

Willingness to serve or participate again.--There was a positive response from committee members who indicated their willingness to serve or to participate again if asked. About nine out of ten committee respondents expressed a willingness to participate again. The percentages of committee members who answered affirmatively were 90%, 88%, 88%, 89%, and 93% in the respective universities.

An even higher percentage of individual participants than committee respondents indicated their willingness to participate again if asked. Their positive responses were 90%, 86%, 93%, 94%, and 92%. The high incidence of willingness to serve on committees again, or to participate individually again is consistent with the findings of Table 11 which relate to the self-satisfaction felt by the individual and the committee participant. It appears that faculty members who are involved in student personnel services are convinced that there is sufficient justification for their continued participation.

Attitude of university toward the student.--The distribution of committee responses in Table 13 reveals that a majority at Illinois and Indiana feel that the university attitude toward the student is one which is a combination of both permissiveness and paternalism. At Purdue 31% of the committee respondents reported paternalistic as the university attitude, while 29% indicated the combined category. Michigan and Wisconsin committee members reported the university attitude as permissive by responses of 41% and 44% respectively.

Among individual participants, 50% at Wisconsin and 39% at Michigan indicated that the university attitude toward students was permissive. The highest percentage of individual participants who indicated paternalistic as the university attitude was found at Purdue where 31% of the respondents selected this category.

Preferred source for recruiting student personnel officers.--The distribution of responses pertaining to the preferred source for recruiting student personnel officers is shown in Table 14. Committee members at three universities indicated a preference for professionally trained workers more than any other. Respondents at two universities reported a preference for recruiting student personnel officers from the ranks of the instructional staff. The third category most often indicated was a combination of both professional specialization and teaching experience. The three categories of professionally trained workers, instructional staff, and a combination of both accounted for committee responses of 70%, 88%, 77%, 65%, and 72% in the five universities.

A majority of individual participants indicated a preference for instructional staff members as the source for recruiting student personnel service officers at only one university. However, at each university the instructional staff category was indicated more often by individual respondents than any other. Professionally trained workers was indicated as the second choice at each university, and a combination of both was reported next as the source for recruiting student personnel staff members. The three categories of professionally trained workers, instructional staff, and a combination of both were indicated by 73%, 68%, 76%, 78%, and 71% in the respective universities.

Summary of findings relative to important issues discussed by committees

Issues discussed by area of student personnel service.--As shown in Table 15, the majority of issues or subjects reported by committee respondents for both Issue A, the first issue discussed by a committee, and Issue A, the second issue discussed by a committee, were designated as pertaining to organization and administration. After the organization and administration area it would appear that financial aid, extra-curricular activities and orientation were taken up as discussion subjects more frequently than any other student personnel service.

Committee recommendations made.--The disposition of committee recommendations on issues or subjects shown in Table 16 indicate that a majority of the recommendations were positively referred. Recommendations were either approved, recommended, or put into effect for Issue A by 73%, 57%, 84%, 66%, and 66% of the total. In the categories indicating that Issue B was positively referred, the responses were 62%, 41%, 59%, 58%, and 53% in the five universities. The high percentage of recommended issues would suggest that committees endorse rather than to take final action.

To whom recommendations made.--The data in Table 17 reveal that the administration was most often the recipient of committee recommendations. The administration was chosen as the primary source for referral of recommendations in Issue A by 65%, 47%, 35%, 40%, and 45% of the committee respondents. In Issue B the administration was indicated by 51%, 38%, 35%, 29%, and 33% of the total.

Action taken on committee recommendations.--Observation of Table 18 reveals that a majority of respondents indicated that committee recommendations were put into effect. Such a selection was made for Issue A by committee respondents in percentages of 64%, 56%, 82%, 57%, and 61% at the respective universities. While the put into effect category constituted a majority of committee respondents for Issue B only at Illinois, the distribution for this category was respectively 53%, 47%, 41%, 37%, and 40% in the institutions.

Preferred action on recommendations.--The majority of committee members expressed the sentiment that committee recommendations should have been put into effect as indicated by the data in Table 19. In Issue A a majority of 73%, 56%, 82%, 69%, and 70% of committee respondents at each university agreed with the action taken. In Issue B the distribution was 64%, 53%, 53%, 49%, and 46% respectively for the responses which indicated that the action preferred was to put the recommendation into effect.

Nature of issues.--The tabulation of whether issues were policy making or program execution is shown in Table 20. The majority of Issue A respondents at four institutions indicated that policy making problems were discussed. Only Purdue did not have a majority in the policy making category for Issue A. For Issue B, two of the five universities reported discussions which were concerned with policy making. However, the other three university respondents chose the policy making more often than they did program execution. About one out of four respondents for both Issue A and Issue B indicated that the deliberations of their committees involved program execution.

Significance of issues.--The significance rating of issues are shown in Table 21. A high percentage of committee respondents indicated that Issue A subjects were significant, and a majority felt this way about Issue B where there was a second issue or subject to consider.

Reasons for reported significance.--The reason indicated more often than any other in Table 22 for the significance rating given by Issue A respondents was that the issue was important. Such a category was indicated by more committee respondents than any other in three of the five universities for Issue B. Among Issue B respondents indicating other reasons for their significance rating of issues, were 40% at Purdue and 24% at Michigan who reported that it pertained to scholastic life. This question was unstructured for the committee respondents in that it allowed committee members to fill in their own reason to explain their significance rating of the issues. In the majority of instances the replies were positive.

Summary of findings relative to relationships between student personnel services

The relationship of one student personnel service to another was presented briefly in Chapter VI. Pearson correlation values were obtained on each of the services which were selected for the investigation to see whether a relationship between one and another area would occur. Both positive and negative relationships were suggested. Pearson correlation values which show the relationship between student personnel services are listed in Table 24.

Summary of findings relative to the hypotheses

In order to test the hypotheses the scores of program effectiveness for each of five universities were obtained from application of the Rackham Student Personnel Services Inventory. Program effectiveness scores were compared with certain levels of faculty participation to determine whether a significant relationship could be found.

The principal findings of the investigation are presented here from Chapter VI which suggest significant relationships between the levels of effectiveness of a program of student personnel services and the extent of faculty participation. The Pearson correlation values necessary to substantiate or reject these hypotheses are taken from Table 25.

1. A negative relationship was found between the *number of committee members* and the over-all effectiveness of a program of student personnel services. The Pearson correlation value obtained was -.89. The null hypothesis is rejected.
2. No significant relationship was indicated between the *number of individual participants* and the levels of effectiveness of a program of student personnel services. The Pearson correlation value was found to be -.50. The null hypothesis is accepted.
3. A positive relationship was indicated between the *academic rank of committee members* and the over-all effectiveness of a program of student personnel services. The Pearson correlation value obtained was +.92. The null hypothesis is rejected.
4. No significant relationship was obtained between the *academic*

rank of individual participants and the over-all program effectiveness of student personnel services. The Pearson correlation value was found to be +.06. The null hypothesis is accepted.

5. The relationship tends to be negative between the *age of committee members* and the over-all effectiveness of a program of student personnel services. The Pearson correlation value obtained was -.63. The null hypothesis is accepted.

6. The relationship tends to be positive between the *age of individual participants* and the over-all effectiveness of a program of student personnel services. A Pearson correlation value of +.74 was found. The null hypothesis is accepted.

Conclusions

The study of faculty participation in the selected student personnel services at the five large public universities revealed some interesting data. The findings lead the investigator to some specific conclusions.

Conclusions based on the extent and nature of faculty participation, as well as on the findings of issues discussed by committees

Faculty participation by age and rank.--There was a tendency to appoint experienced faculty members to committees. Academic rank seemed to be more prevalent in this seniority than did age of the participant. Individual participation seemed to involve junior members of the faculty at each of the universities more than did committee work. In both individual participation and committee work there was a greater proportion from the senior age and academic rank categories.

Amount of monthly participation.--A commitment to participation on the part of faculty members necessitates time away from scholarly research, class preparation, and family life. It would appear that the preponderance of senior academic ranks, and the majority of senior age categories, represented in both individual and committee participation, would indicate that it is the senior faculty member who has the time to spend in student personnel services.

Effectiveness of faculty participation.--Although both committee members and individual participants reported satisfaction with their effectiveness, there appears to be a preference for moderate rather than for the highest rating. The responses indicate that either there is need for improvement, or that the question was not appropriate.

Reason for effectiveness of faculty participation.--There is more reported effectiveness among committee participants than among individual participants. It is the opinion of the investigator that the administrator who serves in an ad hoc relationship with the committee contributes to more effective participation through advice and guidance.

Appreciation of the superior, colleagues, and students for faculty participation.--Less appreciation by the superior, colleagues, and students was indicated for committee work than for individual participation. Perhaps there is better feedback through individual participation than is possible for committee work.

Appreciation of administration for faculty participation.--Although the superior, colleagues, and students have daily contact with the faculty member and know whether he is involved individually or not, it appears that administrative officers have only a casual and rather formally structured method of identifying and expressing appreciation for individual participation. It is easier to honor committee work and to be unaware of individual participation.

Action taken on committee recommendations.--A majority of committee recommendations were put into effect in the first issue, and in the second issue it appears that recommendations were put into effect more than any other alternative available. It would seem that faculty opinion, represented by committee recommendations, exerts a rather strong influence on those who implement policy.

Preferred action on recommendations.--Since committee recommendations were favorably received in the majority of instances, it is not surprising that there was a high incidence of agreement with the action taken on the part of committee respondents.

Nature of issues.--About one of every four committee members reported that the primary issues discussed did not represent policy making but were in the nature of program execution. The majority of committee respondents in each university however reported that policy making issues were considered.

Significance of issues.--Whether committee members were discussing policy making or program implementation, in most instances they felt that they were deliberating significant issues which justified their participation.

Reasons for reported significance.--The faculty members of committees not only felt that they were confronting significant problems, but they reported definite reasons for their evaluation. It would seem that committee members have specific ideas of their own relative to the significance of the issues discussed. Whether these responses were meaningful or merely to document their evaluation of the significance of issues reported could not be determined by this investigation.

Self-satisfaction for faculty participation.--Even though the superior, colleagues, and students did not seem to the faculty member to appreciate committee work, the person who served was apparently satisfied with his participation. Although the administration seemed to be unaware of individual involvement, the one who participated was able to compensate for this in personal gratification. There obviously needs to be some identification of faculty participation and more appreciation shown for services rendered if the best men are to be properly motivated to serve. The faculty members needed to provide the consensus or corporate authority to work toward institutional objectives are busy people. Their involvement needs to be acknowledged as important and appreciated.

Willingness to serve or participate again.--The enthusiasm indicated by both committee members and individual participants in agreeing to serve or participate again is in accordance with the high degree of self-satisfaction indicated previously. The faculty participants seem to be convinced that there is sufficient justification for continuance of their participation.

Attitude of the university toward the student.--The responses from both committee members and individual participants indicate that the combined category of paternalistic-permissive was chosen more than any other. This suggests that a university can be liberal toward student activities now and then, and at other times can be quite protective and authoritarian. The investigator is of the opinion that the terms paternalistic and permissive were not completely understood in many cases. The responses may reflect the attitude of the individual faculty participant rather than the university due to a lack of a clear attitude toward the student on the part of the institution. More sophisticated data is required to analyze university attitude further than was obtained in this investigation.

Preferred source for recruiting student personnel officers.--Committee members at three of the five universities indicated that recruitment should be conducted among the ranks of the professionally trained student personnel worker. Individual participants at each of the universities preferred that instructional staff be the source for recruiting student personnel officers. It would appear that the source for student personnel officers, in the opinion of the respondents, should be determined by the purposes for which a particular administrative student personnel worker is needed.

Committee recommendations made.--Committee members in the majority at four of the five universities reported that issues received some sort of positive recommendation. It is appropriate for the student personnel worker to participate with the committee in its deliberations, to give advice to the members, and to work in close cooperation to ensure that recommendations enhance administrative processes rather than to handicap the individual who is given the ultimate responsibility for implementing policy.

To whom recommendations made.--Recommendations of committees appear to have been made primarily to administrative officials. The information reinforces the belief of the investigator that the jurisdiction and function of committees are basically to refer.

Conclusions based on the findings relative to the hypotheses

An effective complex of student personnel services would be one which had very few faculty members appointed to committees. They would tend to be from the higher academic ranks and would represent the younger age group. In other words, the more committee members who are involved in the decision-making process, the less effective a program becomes. The higher the academic rank of committee members the better is the effectiveness of the program. Finally, the lower the age of faculty members who are appointed to committees, the more effective does the program of student personnel services tend to be.

As for individual participants in an effective program of student personnel services, the characteristics of this type of involvement would be somewhat as follows. It would not matter, first of all, whether there were a few or a great number of participants. The study was unable to indicate a positive relationship one way or another, however the investigator favors involvement of as many persons as possible since it cannot hurt the program and may provide a good source for identifying and recruiting committee members in the future. There was no significant relationship found between academic rank of an individual participant and program effectiveness in this investigation. It is assumed however that those who have something to contribute would be of more value than those without experience, or without a particular talent or interest to share with the students. Therefore, it would probably be better to involve faculty members with academic background and experience. The age of individual participants is correlated positively with program effectiveness in student personnel services. These programs tend to be more successful when they involve older faculty members, even though there is a common assumption that college students distrust anyone who is twice their age and supposedly out of touch and sympathy with their problems. It would appear that the younger faculty members may not be as effective in their individual participation and this is reflected in less successful programs.

Recommendations

Recommendations for additional research

It was indicated earlier that the growth of university size has had a concomitant depersonalization of individual students at the larger institutions of higher learning which is of concern to many authorities. Moreover, many experts believe faculty members have abdicated their traditional position as participants in the ongoing life of the university. They have delegated their historic responsibilities for the student and for institutional administration to specialists while they turn their attention to academic disciplines and increasingly limit their activities to the classroom or the laboratory.

Literature on the extent and nature of the participation of faculty members in student personnel services was found to be limited. It was therefore necessary to construct an interview questionnaire which was designed to measure various aspects of the involvement of faculty members in both committee work and in individual participation. The questions which were framed may or may not reveal the information which is needed in this area. Further investigation along this line would indicate whether a different avenue of research into the validity of faculty participation might have been warranted.

Responses to this study cannot be considered to be representative of all faculty members or of all universities generally. Hence, it is proposed that another investigation be conducted using random sampling techniques. It is further proposed that this study should be concerned with larger numbers of universities. By using a random sample technique at more universities a smaller population might produce more meaningful results. It is further proposed that different types of universities and geographic areas be selected for study.

Investigation is also needed in the various issues which have been discussed by committees. There needs to be further study of the various recommendations made by committees and this should be studied in relationship to the effectiveness of the program. It is important for the administrator to know in what areas faculty members are most likely to be useful, and where the professional might conduct a program without recourse to the academic community more advantageously than identifying and recruiting members of the faculty to plan program and implement decisions for him.

Research needs to be conducted in these areas to convince both the administrator and the faculty participant that contributions are worth the sacrifice. When this occurs faculty members can be brought into the picture in greater numbers than is currently the case, and in those services in which significant value can be achieved. When the administrator feels there is something to be gained by sharing the prerogatives of management he will under-take the task of identifying and recruiting faculty members to share with him the responsibility for policy determination and program implementation. In the opinion of the investigator, once the faculty member is motivated to accept his traditional role for the responsibility of the individual student, he will feel that there is adequate justification for his participation.

There seems to be greater self-satisfaction with the individual who participates than there is with any outside source of appreciation. Of external sources, the appreciation reported by committee members for participation seems to be greater from the administration than from any other source. In the case of individual participation however there seems to be greater awareness on the part of the faculty of appreciation by the superior, the colleague, and the student. Individual participation is perceived as being unrecognized or is just unappreciated by the administration. Studies need to be made of the various sources of appreciation to find better ways to motivate the participation of faculty members in all phases of the student personnel services program.

The need for experienced administrators who are well grounded in the particular specialties of student personnel services will become increasingly acute as institutions of higher learning grow larger and more complex. There is need to recruit from the academic ranks and to educate personnel to fill the positions which will be established or vacated. Whether an individual is best suited for student personnel work who is an experienced member of the instructional staff, or who has had adequate professional preparation is a subject on which diverse opinions are held. There needs to be more study of the value of training as opposed to experience. Appropriate guidelines need to be established for the administrator to follow in staffing positions. Once position requirements are established, the chief student personnel officer will have a more concise picture of the background that student personnel officers need to be reasonably confident of success in administering a particular program.

In the matter of university attitude toward students there is need to update our concept of where the institution should stand in relation to its responsibility for the personal conduct of the individual. Rules and regulations for the preservation of morality may no longer be valid. There is need to determine whether broadly stated objectives which all students are expected to live up to are defensible. Investigation may reveal that a stated code of conduct may not necessarily mean acceptance of standards on the part of the individual student for whom it is intended. The present codes are in many cases unworkable because they are subject to interpretation by those in administrative positions who are themselves incapable of changing the mores of society or often of even successfully interpreting these virtues to the succeeding generation. Perhaps there is a middle ground somewhere in between with which we can equip the student personnel workers to cope with the shifting standards of our time.

Finally, there is need to investigate the very nature of the student personnel administrator himself. What is he? Does he represent an academic officer as an extension of the classroom or is he peripheral to the aims, objectives, and purposes of higher education itself? Should he be responsible to the academic community, to the administration, to the governing board, to the parents, to the students, or a prudent mixture of whatever seems appropriate at the moment?

Further investigation is needed to determine the merits of student personnel services in relation to the main purposes of the academic program. When this is realized the annual battle with instructional administrators for proper funding of student personnel services should become unnecessary. The student personnel administrator can then turn to more productive problems which require his attention.

APPENDIX A

REVISED RACKHAM STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICE PROFILE SCORES

RACKHAM PROFILE SHEET FOR STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICE PROGRAMS

Name of Institution The University of Illinois

Date April 19-20, 1965

AREAS	Counseling	Discipline	Extra-Curricular Activities	Financial Aid	Housing and Board	Organization and Administration	Orientation	Placement
Total Scores	648	162	150	365	820	602	146	593
Excellent	775	185	240	435	925	735	240	735
	743	177	230	417	886	704	230	704
	710	169	220	399	847	673	220	673
	677	[✓ 161]	210	380	[✓ 808]	642	210	642
	[✓ 645]	154	200	[✓ 362]	769	[✓ 611]	200	611
Good	612	146	190	344	729	580	190	[✓ 580]
	579	138	180	325	690	549	180	549
	547	130	169	307	651	518	169	518
	514	123	159	289	612	487	159	487
	482	115	[✓ 149]	270	573	456	[✓ 149]	456
Fair	449	107	139	252	533	425	139	425
	417	99	129	234	494	394	129	394
	384	92	119	215	455	363	119	363
	351	84	108	197	416	332	108	332
	319	76	98	179	377	301	98	301
Poor	286	68	88	160	337	270	88	270
	253	61	78	142	298	239	78	239
	221	53	68	124	259	208	68	208
	188	45	58	105	220	178	58	178
	155	37	48	87	181	147	48	147

RACKHAM PROFILE SHEET FOR STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICE PROGRAMS

Name of Institution Indiana University

Date March 29-30, 1965

AREAS	Counseling	Discipline	Extra-Curricular Activities	Financial Aid	Housing and Board	Organization and Administration	Orientation	Placement
Total Scores	635	155	163	373	828	649	220	531
Excellent	775	185	240	435	925	735	240	735
	743	177	230	417	886	704	230	704
	710	169	220	399	[✓ 847]	673	[✓ 220]	673
	677	161	210	380	808	[✓ 642]	210	642
	[✓ 645]	[✓ 154]	200	[✓ 362]	769	611	200	611
Good	612	146	190	344	729	580	190	580
	579	138	180	325	690	549	180	549
	547	130	169	307	651	518	169	[✓ 518]
	514	123	[✓ 159]	289	612	487	159	487
	482	115	149	270	573	456	149	456
Fair	449	107	139	252	533	425	139	425
	417	99	129	234	494	394	129	394
	384	92	119	215	455	363	119	363
	351	84	108	197	416	332	108	332
	319	76	98	179	377	301	98	301
Poor	286	68	88	160	337	270	88	270
	253	61	78	142	298	239	78	239
	221	53	68	124	259	208	68	208
	188	45	58	105	220	178	58	178
	155	37	48	87	181	147	48	147

PACKHAM PROFILE SHEET FOR STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICE PROGRAMS

Name of Institution The University of Michigan

Date April 26-27, 1965

AREAS	Counseling	Discipline	Extra-Curricular Activities	Financial Aid	Housing and Board	Organization and Administration	Orientation	Placement
Total Scores	623	173	132	417	729	453	220	666
Excellent	775	185	240	435	925	735	240	735
	743	177	230	[✓ 417]	886	704	230	704
	710	[✓ 169]	220	399	847	673	[✓ 220]	[✓ 673]
	677	161	210	380	808	642	210	642
	645	154	200	362	769	611	200	611
Good	[✓ 612]	146	190	344	[✓ 729]	580	190	580
	579	138	180	325	690	549	180	549
	547	130	169	307	651	518	169	518
	514	123	159	289	612	487	159	487
	482	115	149	270	573	[✓ 456]	149	456
Fair	449	107	139	252	533	425	139	425
	417	99	[✓ 129]	234	494	394	129	394
	384	92	119	215	455	363	119	363
	351	84	108	197	416	332	108	332
	319	76	98	179	377	301	98	301
Poor	286	68	88	160	337	270	88	270
	253	61	78	142	298	239	78	239
	221	53	68	124	259	208	68	208
	188	45	58	105	220	178	58	178
	155	37	48	87	181	147	48	147

RACKHAM PROFILE SHEET FOR STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICE PROGRAMS

Name of Institution Purdue University

Date March 31, April 1, 1965

AREAS	Counseling	Discipline	Extra-Curricular Activities	Financial Aid	Housing and Board	Organization and Administration	Orientation	Placement
Total Scores	636	185	118	313	797	626	144	633
Excellent	775	[✓ 185]	240	435	925	735	240	735
	743	177	230	417	886	704	230	704
	710	169	220	399	847	673	220	673
	677	161	210	380	[✓ 808]	642	210	[✓ 642]
	[✓ 645]	154	200	362	769	[✓ 611]	200	611
Good	612	146	190	344	729	580	190	580
	579	138	180	325	690	549	180	549
	547	130	169	[✓ 307]	651	518	169	518
	514	123	159	289	612	487	159	487
	482	115	149	270	573	456	149	456
Fair	449	107	139	252	533	425	[✓ 139]	425
	417	99	129	234	494	394	129	394
	384	92	[✓ 119]	215	455	363	119	363
	351	84	108	197	416	332	108	332
	319	76	98	179	377	301	98	301
Poor	286	68	88	160	337	270	88	270
	253	61	78	142	298	239	78	239
	221	53	68	124	259	208	68	208
	188	45	58	105	220	178	58	178
	155	37	48	87	181	147	48	147

RACKHAM PROFILE SHEET FOR STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICE PROGRAMS

Name of Institution The University of Wisconsin

Date March 8-9, 1965

AREAS	Counseling	Discipline	Extra-Curricular Activities	Financial Aid	Housing and Board	Organization and Administration	Orientation	Placement
Total Scores	582	158	164	395	835	523	162	586
Excellent	775	185	240	435	925	735	240	735
	743	177	230	417	886	704	230	704
	710	169	220	[✓ 399]	[✓ 847]	673	220	673
	677	[✓ 161]	210	380	808	642	210	642
	645	154	200	362	769	611	200	611
Good	612	146	190	344	729	580	190	[✓ 580]
	[✓ 579]	138	180	325	690	549	180	549
	547	130	169	307	651	[✓ 518]	169	518
	514	123	[✓ 159]	289	612	487	[✓ 159]	487
	482	115	149	270	573	456	149	456
Fair	449	107	139	252	533	425	139	425
	417	99	129	234	494	394	129	394
	384	92	119	215	455	363	119	363
	351	84	108	197	416	332	108	332
	319	76	98	179	377	301	98	301
Poor	286	68	88	160	337	270	88	270
	253	61	78	142	298	239	78	239
	221	53	68	124	259	208	68	208
	188	45	58	105	220	178	58	178
	155	37	48	87	181	147	48	147

APPENDIX B

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL TO FACULTY PARTICIPANTS

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

DeKalb, Illinois

April 1, 1965

Dear Dr. -------------------:

One of the dilemmas of a college teacher may be his relationships with students outside of the classroom. In order to secure some answers to this question I am conducting a study of faculty participation in the student personnel services program of several large, multi-purpose universities. Student personnel officers at your university have agreed to cooperate in the study and have given me your name as one who actively participated in the area of ---------------------as-----------------.

The enclosed check-list is designed to secure information about your participation. Only a few minutes are required to provide information essential to the study.

The check-list consists of three parts: Part I is a general information section; Part II pertains to members of a committee and/or governing board; Part III concerns individual participation in non-committee activity. Please complete Part I and either or both of the other two sections which pertain to your type of participation.

Your return of the completed forms in the enclosed return envelope would be sincerely appreciated. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Yours very cordially,

Melvin R. Nickerson
University Center
Northern Illinois University

Encl: check-list
return envelope

APPENDIX C

THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON FACULTY PARTICIPATION

FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES

DIRECTIONS:

> This check-list consists of three parts: Part I for general information; Part II pertains to members of a committee and/or governing board; Part III concerns individual participation in non-committee activity. Please complete Part I and either or both of the other two sections which pertain to your type of participation.

PART I -- GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Name ____

2. University ____

3. Academic Rank (check one)

    ____1. Full Professor
    ____2. Associate Professor
    ____3. Assistant Professor
    ____4. Instructor

4. Age (check one)

    ____1. Under 30
    ____2. 31-40
    ____3. 41-50
    ____4. Over 50

5. Sex (check one)

    ____1. Male
    ____2. Female

6. Would you like to receive a report on the results of this study? (check one)

    ____1. I would
    ____2. I would not

FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES

PART II -- COMMITTEE AND/OR BOARD ACTIVITY

1. Name ______________________________

2. Name of committee and/or board ______________________________

The purpose of Part II is to obtain information on the extent and nature of your participation in committee and/or board activities.

3. How many hours per month (average) have you spent on committee or board activity during the last year? (write in figure) ______

4. Of the time spent on committee and/or board activity how much of it was spent in committee meetings in average hours per month? (write in figure) ______

5. Indicate how you were selected for the committee and/or board. (check one)

   ____1. elected by the faculty
   ____2. selected by the students
   ____3. appointed by the administration
   ____4. volunteered to serve
   ____5. faculty nomination and administrative appointment
   ____6. other (specify) ______________________________

6. In your opinion, what have been the two most important issues or subjects discussed by the committee and/or board during your tenure? (name)

   A. ______________________________

   B.______________________________

   (1) For each of the two most important issues or subjects discussed, which you have identified in item 6 as A. and B., indicate the following:

   (A) What recommendation was made regarding each issue or subject identified as most important? (name)

   A. ______________________________

   B.______________________________

PART II

(B) To whom was the above recommendation made? (check one for each issue)

issue issue

A.____ B.____ 1. the administration
A.____ B.____ 2. the faculty
A.____ B.____ 3. the Board of Regents
A.____ B.____ 4. the students
A.____ B.____ 5. other (name) ______________________

(C) What action was taken on the recommendation for each issue or subject identified as most important? (check one for each issue)

issue issue

A.____ B.____ 1. put into effect
A.____ B.____ 2. deferred
A.____ B.____ 3. rejected
A.____ B.____ 4. other (name) ______________________

(D) In your opinion what action should have taken place in accordance with the recommendation for each issue? (check one for each issue)
It should have been

issue issue

A.____ B.____ 1. put into effect
A.____ B.____ 2. deferred
A.____ B.____ 3. rejected
A.____ B.____ 4. other (name)______________________

(2) For each of the two most important issues or subjects which you have identified in item 6 as A. and B., what was the nature of the discussion and what was its significance in helping to fulfill the aims and objectives of this area of student personnel work?

(A) Indicate below the nature of the issue or problem and its significance. (check one for each issue identified)

Issue	Nature	Significance
A.	___1. policy making ___2. program execution	___1. significant ___2. insignificant
B.	___1. policy making ___2. program execution	___1. significant ___2. insignificant

PART II

(B) Why do you consider each of the important issues or subjects discussed significant or insignificant?

A. ____

B. ____

7. Indicate which of the following statements, if any, represent your reason for accepting this committee and/or board assignment. (check all that apply)

____1. would enable me to interpret the academic point of view
____2. believe in student centered approach
____3. it is a faculty responsibility that someone has to do
____4. is a responsibility which I was encouraged to accept
by whom? ____________________________________

8. How would you rate the effectiveness of the committee in helping to fulfill the aims and objectives of this area of student personnel work? (check one)

____1. greatly effective
____2. moderately effective
____3. neutral
____4. slightly ineffective
____5. extremely ineffective

9. Why do you feel the way you do about the effectiveness of the committee? (check all that apply)

____1. important topics were discussed
____2. most recommendations were implemented
____3. recommendations were ignored
____4. too much time spent on busy work
____5. topics should be referred to experts

10. Of the several sources of possible appreciation and encouragement for your continued participation check those from which you receive negative and/or positive reaction.

yes	no	
____1.	____2.	A. your colleagues
____1.	____2.	B. your superior
____1.	____2.	C. students
____1.	____2.	D. the administration
____1.	____2.	E. self-satisfaction

PART II

11. If you were invited to serve on the committee and/or board again would you agree to do so? (check one)

____1. yes ____2. no

12. What is the attitude of the University toward the student? (check one)

____1. paternalistic
____2. permissive
____3. both
____4. other (name)____

13. What should be the source for recruiting new student personnel officers? (check one)

____1. instructional staff
____2. professionally trained workers
____3. other (name) ____

FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES

PART III -- INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPATION

1. Name ______________________________

2. Area of Student Personnel Services ______________________

The purpose of Part III is to obtain information on the extent and nature of individual faculty participation in the student personnel services program. If you have participated as an adviser, counselor, chaperone, consultant, or otherwise during the current year please fill out a Part III form.
Note: academic advising is excluded from this study.

3. During the current year what role did you play as a faculty participant, how many hours per month (average), and on how many separate occasions per month did you participate in this role? (write in role and figure)

role (adviser, counselor, consultant, participant, etc. -- name)	hours spent per month (average -- write in figure)	number of times involved per month (average -- write in figure)

4. How often do you accept an opportunity to participate? (check one)

____1. always
____2. often
____3. seldom

5. Indicate how you were selected to participate. (check one)

____1. elected by the faculty
____2. appointed by the administration
____3. recruited by students
____4. faculty nomination, administrative appointment
____5. volunteered
____6. other (name) ______________________________

PART III

6. How effective was your individual contribution in helping to fulfill the aims and objectives of this area of student personnel work? (check one)

____1. greatly effective
____2. moderately effective
____3. neutral
____4. slightly ineffective
____5. extremely ineffective

7. Why do you feel this way about the effectiveness of your contribution in helping to fulfill the aims and objectives of ______________________? (name)
(area)

____

____

8. Indicate which of the following reasons, if any, represent your motivation for agreeing to participate. (check all that apply)

____1. am interested in this area
____2. someone has to do it
____3. wanted to share in program execution
____4. serve only because I was encouraged to participate by whom? ______________________________________
____5. other (name)______________________________________

9. Which of the following statements, if any, represent your feelings about your personal participation in this area? (check all that apply)

____1. it is an extension of the classroom requiring faculty participation
____2. opportunity for development of student is enhanced by this area
____3. inadequate time exists to do what is necessary in this area
____4. this area deals primarily with busy work
____5. activity in this area is anti-intellectual
____6. this area should be referred to experts
____7. activity by faculty members in this area is ineffective
____8. other (name) ______________________________________

PART III

10. Do you feel that appreciation and encouragement for you to continue to participate in this area is exhibited by each of the groups listed? (check all that apply)

yes no

____1. ____2. A. your colleagues
____1. ____2. B. your superior
____1. ____2. C. students
____1. ____2. D. the administration
____1. ____2. E. self-satisfaction

11. If you were invited to participate in this area again would you agree to do so? (check one)

____1. yes ____2. no

12. What is the attitude of the University toward the student? (check one)

____1. paternalistic
____2. permissive
____3. both
____4. other (name) ________________________________

13. What should be the source for recruiting new student personnel officers? (check one)

____1. instructional staff
____2. professionally trained workers
____3. other (name) ________________________________

APPENDIX D

TOPICAL TABULATION OF ISSUES DISCUSSED BY COMMITTEES

TOPIC AND NUMBER OF ISSUES DISCUSSED BY FIVE OR MORE COMMITTEES

Topic Discussed	Issue A	Issue B
Extra-curricular activities	11	9
Selection of personnel	11	9
Budgeting procedures, financial problems	8	9
Selection of financial aid recipients	12	5
Adding facilities, services, opportunities, to an existing program	8	7
Safety and health, room inspections	8	7
Auditorium and visiting speaker policy	7	7
Program implementation	10	4
Program planning	10	4
Intercollegiate athletics	7	6
Orientation program, activities	6	5
University role in moral issues	6	5
Criteria for granting financial aids	6	4
Definition of organization, procedures, role	6	4
Discipline problems	7	2
Housing conditions, residence halls	5	4
Intramural athletics and recreation	7	2
Procurement of funds	4	5
Promoting attendance, recruiting members, improving interest and program	3	6

TOPICAL LISTING

	Issue A	Issue B
Scholastic requirements, standards, climate	4	5
Student participation in decision-making process in determining university policy	7	1
University role in students' affairs, in moral issues	5	3
Open speaker forum, student rights	7	
Sex problems, "open" room policy, women's hours	2	5
Administration of discipline	3	3
Elimination of discrimination	2	4
Expansion of services	1	5
Financial assistance based on need, evaluation	4	2
Whether to join Merit Scholarship Program, College Scholarship Service, N.D.E.A.	3	3
Admission qualifications	4	1
Coordination of functions, services, committee jurisdiction	4	1
Coordination of vacation with public school calendar	3	2
Educationally disadvantaged	4	1
Emphasis on academic orientation as opposed to social program	3	2
Liberalization of housing regulations	1	4

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Abbott, Frank C. Faculty-Administration Relationships. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1958.

Arbuckle, Dugald S. Student Personnel Services in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1953.

Barnard, Chester I. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1948.

Brumbaugh, A. J. Research Designed to Improve Institutions of Higher Learning. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1958.

Campbell, William Giles. Form and Style in Thesis Writing. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1954.

Corson, John J. Governance of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.

Dodds, Harold W. The Academic President--Educator or Caretaker? New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962.

Fowlkes, John Guy. Higher Education for American Society. New York: W. S. Hall & Company, 1949.

Hungate, Thad L. Management in Higher Education. New York: Columbia University Bureau of Publications, 1964.

Kerr, Clark. The Uses of the University. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1964.

Lloyd-Jones, Esther and Smith, Margaret Ruth. A Student Personnel Program for Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1938.

________. Student Personnel Work As Deeper Teaching. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954.

Long, John D. Needed Expansion of Facilities for Higher Education--1958-1970--How Much Will It Cost? Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1958.

Millett, John D. *The Academic Community*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962.

Mueller, Kate Hevner. *Student Personnel Work in Higher Education*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961.

Strang, Ruth. *The Role of the Teacher in Personnel Work*. New York: Columbia University Bureau of Publications, 1953.

Turabian, Kate L. *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Underwood, Benton J., *et al*. *Elementary Statistics*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954.

Williamson, E. G. *Student Personnel Services in Colleges and Universities*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961.

Woodburne, Lloyd S. *Principles of College and University Administration*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1958.

Wrenn, Charles C. *Student Personnel Work in College*. New York: The Ronald Press, 1951.

Articles and Periodicals

American Association of University Professors, Committee S. "Statement on Faculty Responsibility for the Academic Freedom of Students," *A.A.U.P. Bulletin*, L (September, 1964), pp. 254-57.

American Association of University Professors, Committee T. "Faculty Participation in College and University Government," *A.A.U.P. Bulletin*, XLVIII, No. 4 (December, 1962), p. 321.

Henderson, Algo D. "Improving Decision Making Through Research," *Current Issues in Higher Education--1963*, XVIII (March, 1963), p. 154.

Mooney, Ross L. "The Problem of Leadership in the University," *Harvard Educational Review*, XXXIII, No. 1 (Winter, 1963), pp. 42-57.

Wrenn, Charles C., and Kamm, R. B. "A Procedure for Evaluating a Student Personnel Program," *School and Society*, XLVII (1948), pp. 266-69.

Wilson, Logan. "College Student May Become 'Forgotten Man' of Education," *Higher Education and National Affairs*, XIII (October 23, 1964), p. 7.

Reports

National Beta Club. College Facts Chart for 1964-1965. (as of October 1, 1964). Edited by J. W. Harris. Clinton, South Carolina: Jacobs Brothers, Printers, 1965.

Unpublished Material

Hage, Robert S. "A Revision of the Rackham Student Personnel Services Inventory." Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, Iowa City, Iowa, The State University of Iowa, 1957.

Mahler, Clarence A. "A Study of Student and Faculty Reactions to Student Personnel Work." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Minneapolis, Minnesota, The University of Minnesota, 1956.

Rackham, Eric N. "The Determination of Criteria of the Evaluation of Student Personnel Services in Institutions of Higher Learning." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Ann Arbor, Michigan, The University of Michigan, 1950.